FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-87-229
Monday
30 November 1987

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-87-229 CONTENTS *30 November 1987*

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Karpov Discusses ABM Treaty, Disarmament ... 1
Tashkent Peace Conference Opens 27 Nov ... 1
    Greeted by Gorbachev ... 1
    Demichev Delivers Report ... 2
    Communique Issued 29 Nov ... 2
Gerasimov on Binary Chemical Weapons ... 3
FRG Chemical Storage Facility Viewed ... 3
U.S. Trying To Make SDI 'Irreversible' ... 4
Shabanov: USSR Will Counter SDI If Realized ... 4
SDI Undermines 'Strategic Stability' *[Nazarenko in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Nov]* ... 5
Warsaw Pact's Kulikov Views INF, SDI, Baltic *[Norway ARBEIDERBLADET 23 Nov]* ... 6
Kornilov Comments on U.S. Opponents of Treaty ... 7
Experts To Work 'Urgently' on Treaty Wording ... 7
Kobysh Notes Significance of INF Accord ... 8
Shultz Remarks on INF Treaty Quoted ... 8
Conventional Weapon Talks Continue in Vienna ... 9

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Yazov Returns From Bucharest; Met by Medvedev *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Nov]* ... 10
Conference Views World Socialism Problems *[PRAVDA 26 Nov]* ... 10

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' *[N. Levin, V. Kobysh, N. Shishlin]* ... 11
Gorbachev Greets International Conference ... 15
UN Distributes Joint Memorandum on Security *[V. Sukhoy in PRAVDA 25 Nov]* ... 15
    'All-Embracing System' Sought *[IZVESTIYA 25 Nov]* ... 16
    Petrovskiy: All-Important Idea ... 17
UN'S Perez de Cuellar on USSR-U.S. Agreement ... 17
More on Rogachev Briefing: Japanese Ties ... 17
ICFTU Chairman on Talk With Gorbachev *[TRUD 20 Nov]* ... 17
Foreign Ministry Official on CSCE Anniversary ... 18
Daily on Restructuring of Foreign Policy *[V. Katin in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 24 Nov]* ... 19
Correction to 'Top Priority' on Summit, INF ... 21

REAGAN-GORBACHEV SUMMIT

PRAVDA Editorial Article on Arms Limits *[28 Nov]* ... 22
Lessons of 1959, 1973 Summits Pondered *[Yefimov, Kondrashov in IZVESTIYA 28 Nov]* ... 23
Kuznetsov Views Ties Prior to Summit ... 26
Karpov Cited on Arms Talks at Summit ... 27
U.S. 'Struggle' Over Dialogue Noted ... 27
Gorbachev Interview With NBC, Relay Reported ... 28

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Reagan Interviewed by BBC on Upcoming Summit ... 29
'Anti-Soviet Campaign' in U.S Media Reported ... 29
Congress, Right-Wing Criticisms Noted ... 29

Gen Razuvanov on U.S. CW Information 30
U.S. Tests Air-Launched Cruise Missile 31
Titan Rocket Launched To Deploy Satellite 31
Gerasimov Cited on Background to Shapiro Case 31
Comparison of Reagan, Opposition Remarks 32

China

Gorbachev Discusses Soviet-Chinese Relations 32
NOVOSTI Pamphlet on Relations With PRC 32
World Events Depend on USSR-PRC Relations *[Ivanov]* 32
Bilateral Water Use Accord Signed 33
Ties With PRC, India Considered Good *[Kudrin]* 33
Li Peng Cited on Intentions as Premier *[IZVESTIYA 26 Nov]* 33
U.S. 'Campaign' on Tibet Question Condemned 34
PRC Continues Process of Economic Reforms *[Korzin]* 34

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Australia's Hawke Visits Soviet Union 34
    Hawke Interviewed 34
    Shevardnadze, Ambassador Discuss Visit 36
    Leaves Canberra 36
    Hayden Arrives in Moscow *[Melbourne]* 36
    Hawke Arrives in Moscow 36
    Hawke Arrives in Leningrad 36
    Kamentsev Greets Hawke 36
Australian-Soviet Human Rights Pact Doubted *[Melbourne]* 37
SRV Defense Minister Receives Admiral Kurik 37
Envoy Hands Gromyko Message To Aquino 37

Near East & South Asia

DRA Grand Assembly Begins Session 29 Nov 38
    Najibullah Address 38
    Najibullah Elected President 39
    Assembly Approves Constitution 39
Najibullah Receives Soviet Planning Official 39
Najibullah Honors Soviet Troops in DRA *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 11 Nov]* 39
USSR, DRA Sign Cpoperation Protocol 22 Nov 39
Pakistan's Atomic Bomb, U.S. 'Aid' Scored *[Adrianov]* 39
Quest for Southern Asian Stability Viewed *[PRAVDA 17 Nov]* 40
Jordan's King Receives Visiting Soviets 42
USSR Delegation Leaves for PDRY Celebrations 42
Soviet Naval Vessels Conclude Visit to Aden 42

Sub-Saharan Africa

Zambia's Kenneth Kaunda Continues Visit 42
    Received by Gorbachev *[PRAVDA 28 Nov]* 42
    Leaves for Leningrad 44
    Interviewed on Visit 44
OAU Council of Ministers on Indebtedness 45
Kozlovskiy Receives Zimbabwean Visitors *[IZVESITYA 27 Nov]* 45

East Europe

Polls Open in Polish Nationwide Referendum 45
    Further Report 46
    Turnout for Referendum 46
    Jerzy Urban Comments 46

- Ryzhkov Meets With Poland's Szalajda 47
- Bulgaria, Iran Start Parliamentary Relations 47
- Bulgaria To Allow 'Unlimited' Poll Candidates *[IZVESTIYA 25 Nov]* 47
- Romanian Fuel Shortage Problem Described *[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 19 Nov]* 47
- Moscow TV Carries Documentary on Albania 48

West Europe

- Shevardnadze Receives UK Envoy Cartledge 49
- AUCCTU Delegation Arrives in Britain 49
- Belgium Announces Halt to Cruise Missile Work 49
- EEC Foreign Ministers Meet in Brussels 49
- Shevardnadze Receives West German Ambassador 50
- FRG Spokesman on Support for Arms Treaty 50
- 'Defense Concepts' Weighed at Bavarian Talks 50
- France Conducts Nuclear Test 29 Nov 50
- Ligachev Departs for French CP Congress 50
  - Welcomed at Airport 51
- Paris Literature Forum 'Frankly Anti-Soviet' *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 25 Nov]* 51
- AUCCTU Delegation Attends Italian Seminar *[TRUD 24 Nov]* 52
- Italian CP Meeting Endorses Report on Reforms 52
- Portugal's Soares Continues Visit 52
  - Departs Moscow for Yerevan *[IZVESTIYA 27 Nov]* 52
  - Tours Oil Installation 52
  - Makes Stopover in Kiev 53
  - Departs for Lisbon 30 Nov 53
- Visit to CP of the Peoples of Spain *[PRAVDA 21 Nov]* 53
  - Delegation Departs Madrid 53
- Joint Venture Agreement With Switzerland 53
- Netherlands Official Welcomes INF Treaty 53
- Finnish Social Democrats Mark Great October *[PRAVDA 18 Nov]* 54
  - Finnish Communists Celebrate *[PRAVDA 24 Nov]* 54

Latin America & Caribbean

- Chilean Communist Party Political Report 54

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

- Vasilyev Sees 'Bonapartism' in Leaders *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 15 Nov]* 62
- RSFSR Council of Ministers on Water Supply *[IZVESTIYA 26 Nov]* 65
- Tsentrosoyuz Council on Consumer Cooperatives 65
- Demichev Decorates Moscow Chief Rabbi 66
- Official on Jewish Emigration 'Campaign' 66
- Turkmen Interior Minister Explains Visas 66
- Conference Considers Mankind's 'Problems' 67
- World Muslim Congress Delegation Visits Moscow 67
  - Vorontsov Receives Congress Leader 67
  - Visit Ends 67
- First Unit at Khmelnitskiy AES Starts Up *[PRAVDA 22 Nov]* 68
- CPSU Lecturers' Seminar Views Restructuring *[PRAVDA 21 Nov]* 68
- Publication of Banned Novels Examined *[LITERNATURAYA GAZETA 18 Nov]* 68
- Failings of Political Publishing Discussed *[Nenashev in PRAVDA 24 Nov]* 69
- Lenin Warned Stalin Against 'Local Anarchy' *[MOSCOW NEWS 15 Nov]* 72
- Revised 1917 Revolution Encyclopedia Reviewed *[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 13 Nov]* 74

Economic

- Abalkin on Scrapping Unprofitable Enterprises 75

Karpov Discusses ABM Treaty, Disarmament

LD300950 Moscow TASS in English 0845 GMT 30 Nov 87

[Text] Moscow November 30 TASS—TASS diplomatic correspondent reports:

"A Soviet-American treaty providing for the elimination of two classes of armaments has been prepared for signing and subsequent ratification. Now if one wishes to advance successfully along the difficult path of nuclear-missile disarmament one should devote special attention to the relationship between the reduction of strategic offensive armaments and the preservation of the 1972 ABM Treaty", Viktor Karpov has stated. The head of the department on the Arms and Disarmament Problems of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs gave an interview on this problem today to the TASS diplomatic correspondent. He said that the point at issue was the preservation of the ABM Treaty during an agreed period of time in a full volume of the commitments involved. This is not an artificial linkage but a profound internal and logical connection.

When the ABM Treaty was being worked out both sides proceeded from the assumption that it is only on this basis, i.e. on the basis of giving up the deployment of large-scale ABM systems that progress in the reduction of strategic offensive armaments can be achieved, Karpov continued. This assumption continues to be valid today. This is why it is necessary to reach agreement on ensuring stability of strategic relations between the USSR and the U.S. for a long period of time, in our opinion, for at least ten years. This can be done if both sides pledge not to take advantage of the right to withdraw from the treaty during that period. Otherwise it will be impossible to achieve the reduction of strategic armaments because the lack of confidence that the other side will not simultaneously take steps aimed at changing the strategic balance in its favour, specifically, by creating systems that would jeopardize the security of the other side.

The Soviet expert said that in this connection the question was often asked: What should be the attitude to the allegiance of the U.S. Administration to the SDI program or the "Star Wars" program, as it is also called. It should be pointed out that the SDI program, if implemented, would be a violation of the ABM Treaty and would lead to the destabilization of the strategic relationship between our two countries. However, the Soviet Union is not holding talks with the U.S. about that internal American program. It is the U.S. Administration and the U.S. Congress which are to resolve the SDI problem, Karpov emphasized. So far as the Soviet-American interstate relations are concerned, what matters is the strict and full-scale observance by the sides of the ABM Treaty in the form in which it was signed and ratified in 1972.

"An agreement on the problem of the reduction of strategic offensive armaments on condition of the preservation of the ABM Treaty is a promising and realistic way to achieving progress in joint Soviet-American efforts aimed at the elimination of nuclear armaments", Karpov said.

Tashkent Peace Conference Opens 27 Nov

Greeted by Gorbachev

LD271427 Moscow TASS in English 1401 GMT 27 Nov 87

[Text] Tashkent November 27 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU), has sent a message to the participants in the international conference "For a Nuclear-Weapon-Free and Non-Violent World" which opened today in the capital of Uzbekistan (the Soviet Central Asian Republic). It was read out at the conference's sitting.

Follows the full text of the message:

"I whole-heartedly greet the participants in the international conference on the occasion of the first anniversary of the Delhi Declaration on principles for a nuclear-weapon-free and non-violent world.

"The document became a response to the challenge of the times under conditions when mankind has approached a turning point in its history. Nowadays nuclear weapons threaten with annihilation of terrestrial civilisation and of the entire humankind. The problem of saving life on earth has become a stern reality which imperatively calls for immediate actions. Tomorrow it may be too late.

"The Delhi Declaration which constitutes an example of the new political thinking and formulates principles for building a new world in which confrontation would be replaced by cooperation and contentious issues would be resolved only by political means. The declaration asserts peaceful coexistence as the only possible norm of contacts between countries and peoples.

"The immense vital power of the declaration is evidenced already by the fact that it is the result of the joint creative endeavour of the two great peoples—Soviet and Indian—each arriving at the ideas expressed in the declaration in its own way. Friendship and cooperation between the Soviet Union and India have now become a model of relations for states with different social systems.

"The new thinking makes its way with difficulty. There are still a good deal of forces which continue to worship the nuclear idol and think in the categories of military confrontation. But the beginning of a positive process in the world has been set, and the first signs of changes for the better are manifest.

"Your forum is a convincing illustration of the growing awareness of the international public at large and of its support for the ideas of the Delhi Declaration. I am convinced that the conference will serve the lofty goal of educating peoples in the spirit of peace, respect and non-violence.

"I wish successes to your conference.

[Signed] Mikhail Gorbachev"

Demichev Delivers Report

LD271432 Moscow TASS in English 1356 GMT 27 Nov 87

[Text] Tashkent November 27 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, sent a message of greeting to an international conference for a nuclear-weapon free and non-violent world, which was read out at the forum's opening here today.

A message from Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi was read out as well.

The conference, sponsored in Tashkent, capital of the Soviet Central Asian Republic of Uzbekistan, by the Soviet Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Committee, is being attended by prominent statesmen, politicians and leaders of mass movements and organizations in Afghanistan, India, Vietnam, the Yemen Arab Republic, Iraq, Syria, Kampuchea, Egypt, the Philippines, Nepal, Laos, the USSR and other countries.

The meeting opened exactly a year after Mikhail Gorbachev and Rajiv Gandhi signed in the Indian capital the Delhi Declaration on principles for a nuclear-weapon free and non-violent world.

The conference is the first in a series of representative forums being held in the USSR and abroad on the first anniversary of the historic document which has defined principles for building a world free of nuclear weapons and violence at the crucial phase in mankind's history.

The report "The Delhi Declaration and the Present-Day World" was delivered by Petr Demichev, an alternate member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and a first vice-president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Communique Issued 29 Nov

LD291355 Moscow TASS in English 1220 GMT 29 Nov 87

[Text] Tashkent November 29 TASS—Follows the full text of a communique issued by an international conference for a nuclear-weapon free and non-violent world:

An international conference for a nuclear-weapon free and non-violent world took place in Tashkent on November 27 through 29. It was devoted to the first anniversary of the Delhi Declaration signed by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi of the Republic of India, who represent one-fifth of mankind.

The meeting, which was sponsored by the Soviet Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Committee, was attended by statesmen, politicians and leaders of mass organizations of Afghanistan, Vietnam, Egypt, India, the Yemen Arab Republic, Kampuchea, Laos, Malaysia, Mongolia, Nepal, Pakistan, Syria, the Palestine Liberation Organization, the Soviet Union, the Philippines and Iraq.

All the participants in the forum unanimously welcomed messages from Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi of the Republic of India.

The conference was opened by Inamzhon Usmankhodzhayev, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan. Reports were made by Petr Demichev, an alternate member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and a first vice-president of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, and Kedar Nath Singh, general secretary of the Indian National Congress (I) Party.

The conferees pointed to the historic significance of the Delhi Declaration. Although the document has been signed by the leaders of two countries with different socio-political systems, one of which is a major nuclear power and the other a leading non-aligned country, the declaration's provisions are of universal nature and use. It is a document corresponding to the realities of our age and showing a way for mankind to achieve a lasting peace without nuclear weapons and violence.

They declared that peaceful coexistence must become a universal norm in international relations. The ideal and principles of the Delhi Declaration, embodying a new vision of the world, have already begun to yield palpable results.

The participants in the conference expressed concern at the same time about the fact that forces hostile to peace are reluctant to give up their positions. In this connection the Tashkent conference stressed the usefulness of such forums and the importance of uniting the efforts of broadest possible public sections in the interest of realizing the principles proclaimed by the declaration.

The speakers hailed the forthcoming signing at a Soviet-American summit meeting of a treaty for eliminating intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles and expressed the hope that this important step will lead to further cuts in nuclear weapons in the world, up to and including their complete abolition.

The Tashkent conference was held in the form of a free and constructive dialogue. Its participants voiced profound gratitude to the government and public of Uzbekistan for the affable hospitality they had felt throughout their stay on the soil of the Uzbek Republic.

Gerasimov on Binary Chemical Weapons

LD291918 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 29 Nov 87

[From the "International Panorama" program, presented by Gennadiy Gerasimov]

[Text] Disarmament, of course, has to extend to so-called conventional weapons, of which there are also too many—in some types on their side and in some on our side. The West has now started talking about the principle of assymetrical reductions. This is not a bad principle if it is understood as a leveling of armaments at minimum levels, right down to zero. The optimal minimum level is zero—let's say the medium-range and shorter-range missiles level—in the near future. A third zero has now appeared within reach too, for chemical weapons. There is already agreement on many points of an appropriate convention, and experts have visited stockpiles that had previously been totally secret.

But it seems that the United States is taking a step back here. They are planning to begin production shortly of a novelty—binary weapons—saying that they have to have it as insurance since these weapons could turn up in the possession of anyone. They even praise these weapons on occasion as weapons that preserve property and are bound to kill—that is, they spare society subsequent worries about cripples and invalids. The U.S. Army has stockpiled a lot of these barbaric weapons in Europe.

FRG Chemical Storage Facility Viewed

LD292358 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 29 Nov 87

[From the "International Panorama" program, presented by Gennadiy Gerasimov; Vladimir Kondratyev video report]

[Text] [Kondratyev] The region of Pflaz, which is in the west of the FRG, is famous for its dense expanses of forest. Industry isn't strongly developed here. Tourism predominates. Over the last 2 centuries Pfalz has on more than one occasion served as the bridgehead for campaigns of conquest against France, and has in its turn been subjected to devastating retaliatory strikes. In the last war the Hitlerites turned the land of Pfalz into something like Swiss cheese, building numerous bunkers and tunnels there.

After the fall of the Third Reich, the underground structures were initially used by the French, whose zone of occupation included Pfalz. But in 1952 the Americans took up firm residence here. The federal land of Rheinland-Palantinate, where the locality that is the subject of our tale is located, as was admitted by Prime Minister Vogel, is without doubt the largest unsinkable U.S. aircraft carrier abroad. It also enjoys the dubious fame of being the largest armaments store in the Western world.

Practically everything is stockpiled in the Palatinate forest: from soldier's underwear to nuclear warheads. The local authorities can only guess what specifically is accomodated by their bedside. The Americans, as mayor of the community of Dahn, (Hermann Eckerle) confirms, do not consider it necessary to inform the population. However, you can't avoid information of another type here: No Entry, No Photography, Military Zone, Site is Guarded by Dangerous Dogs, and suchlike.

But in spite of the curtain of mystery, it is known for example that in the region of the community of Dahn, in the small town of Fischbach, U.S. chemical weapons are stockpiled. The FRG is the only country in NATO that has made its territory available to the Americans for the silent death, as the combat toxic substances are called. Their effect has been well-known since the times of World War I. Death comes painfully and inevitably as a result of striking the breathing passages and the heart muscles. The effects of poisonous gas were so terrible that as early as 1925 the Geneva Convention was signed prohibiting the use of toxic systems.

After World War II the accumulation of chemical munitions progressed at a rapid pace in the West, primarily in the United States, right up to 1970. The exact figure is probably known only in the Pentagon. But Western specialists estimate that the overall volume amounts to about 400,000 tonnes, including reserves, and something like 10-15,000 tonnes is stockpiled in Palatinate. It has been calculated thusly: to destroy everything living over an area of 1 hectare, 10 kg of (zarin), 5 kg of (zaman) or 3 kg of the substance (VX) is sufficient; and for one man, only 0.2 milligrams is needed.

The modern army currently possesses effective means of protection, and for this reason chemical weapons present a threat mainly to the civilian population. This doesn't have to be during military actions. It is prohibited to take pictures inside the bunkers near Fischbach, but it is no secret that storage is carried out there in quite a careless way. The reservoirs of nerve-paralyzing gas are quite old, and have begun to rust. The probability of a leak is increasing. It is true, there is a signal device: a rabbit in a cage. This, if you will, the last word in technology, is to give warning of danger. Last year the Federal Government announced that, through an accord with the Americans, chemical weapons would be withdrawn from the country by 1992.

It is true, at the same time Bonn practically gave the green light to the creation of binary charges in the United States. The significance of this, as is graphically explained by Professor of Mainz University (Werner Dosch) lies in the fact that, from the two harmless components, when they are joined together a substance of enormous strike power is formed. The promise to our government, the professor says, is unrealistic. It is more and more obvious that the reservoirs of poisonous substances cannot be withdrawn so simply. They can only be destroyed on site, and for this about 16 years will be needed, if not more.

But however great the risk might be, there is no other way out. There is not just the risk of a possible leak. Palatinate isn't just crammed with stockpiles. The gigantic Ramstein airfield is located here. Not so long ago there was a remarkable event in the FRG, which the Bundeswehr would like to have celebrated, but all the same subsequently refrained on moral grounds. The last Lockheed 104 aircraft had been decommissioned, better known under the name of Starfighter. At the end of the 1950's the then Minister of Defense Strauss insisted on buying these machines in the United States, although it was clear from the very outset that they were not suitable for the all-weather conditions of the FRG. The warnings were justified: Of the 900 fighter-bombers of this type, more than 200 have had accidents since then in the FRG. A joke was even doing the rounds on this topic: Question—How can you get personal possession of a Starfighter? Answer—You buy a plot of land, and just wait; the Starfighter will fall on you itself. This is the sort of black humor, which, unfortunately, has its share of the truth.

The flying coffins have been replaced by more modern Tornadoes, F-16's, but even they crash from time to time. In June this year, a few kilometers from underground chemical stockpiles, a U.S. aircraft crashed, the fifth over the last year and a half here. It is even difficult to imagine what will happen if such a huge thing cuts its way into a bunker and explodes. It is natural that the local inhabitants do not wish, to put it figuratively, to sit on a nerve-paralyzing barrel. They are protesting against the plans of the Palatinate government for new bunkers for the NATO Command in the event of war. The people of Palatinate, like the whole of the Federal Republic, sighed with relief when the process of talks for the elimination of nuclear missiles in Europe began.

But together with satisfaction there came new disquiet: NATO circles had started talking about the need to compensate for the nuclear missiles potential subject to reduction. NATO, the Bonn Ministry of Defense considers, needs new tanks, new guns, new shells, new stores for conventional arms, which, in the words of the hawks, are in catastrophically short supply. The implementation of such designs can only mean a further expansion of the whole military infrastructure in the main unsinkable aircraft carrier of the United States, the Rheinland-Palatinate region.

U.S. Trying To Make SDI 'Irreversible'

LD281301 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1110 GMT 28 Nov 87

[Text] Moscow, 28 Nov (TASS)—The USSR comes out consistently for the prevention of the militarization of space, assuming that any other development of events would raise the arms race to a new, even more dangerous height. Bearing in mind the realities of the nuclear age, an article published in edition No 12 of the magazine *Mezhdunarodnaya Zhizn* says, one cannot but see an internal connection between the halting of the arms race on earth and the prevention of its transfer into space. One must not close one channel of the arms race to open up another, qualitatively new channel. It is precisely for this reason that the USSR is striving to reach an agreement with the United States on considerable reductions in nuclear arms, and then their complete elimination; under the condition, of course, of the nonsiting of arms in space, against which, as is well-known, the U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative" is directed.

Thus, SDI is exerting its pernicious influence on the resolution of the problem of limiting and reducing nuclear arms, the article notes. It was precisely SDI which wrecked the opportnity to reach substantive accords at the meeting in Reykjavik. The combination of a growth in offensive strategic weapons with plans to create an antimissile defence with space-based elements at the end of last year has already led to a U.S. violation of the SALT II Treaty. Furthermore, the creation of such new types of weapons for the SDI as nuclear-triggered lasers requires that nuclear explosions be carried out in space and, in the future, that equipment [obyekty] carrying weapons of mass destruction be put into space.

One thing is clear: Even now the administration is trying, through deployment [razvertyvaniye] of just individual components of the SDI, to reach a situation where the SDI program itself becomes irreversible.

Of course, the USSR is capable of giving an appropriate response to the SDI, as it considers necessary, without being drawn into the arms race along the channels which the United States would like to draw it. But its goodwill should not be interpreted as weakness, the journal stresses. The USSR is convinced that there is an alternative to the SDI. It favors stopping the arms race on earth and preventing its transfer into space. With this aim it has proposed a specific program of measures and has embarked upon practical implementation of it. The Soviet-U.S. treaty on the elimination of two classes of nuclear missiles—medium and shorter range missiles—should be the first important step in the required direction.

Shabanov: USSR Will Counter SDI If Realized

LD292056 Moscow TASS in English 2017 GMT 29 Nov 87

[Text] Moscow November 29 TASS—The aggressive essence of the U.S. Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI) programme is the subject of the documentary "Star Wars—The Anxieties of the World" which was shown on the Central Television Network of the USSR for the first time today.

On the strength of archival data the film makers show that as far back as at the end of World War Two U.S. military strategists nurtured plans to get into outer space and to keep an eye on the entire planet. The same laboratories where the first A-bomb was developed are busy working out projects for the deployment of strike weapons in the near-earth space.

A footage shows the Livermore National Laboratory which designed an X-ray nuclear-pumped laser and which is developing other SDI-related elements. The TV camera shows the Nevada test range where specimens of new technology from Livermore are tested.

"Facts indicate that the Washington-devised 'Strategic Defence Initiative' is none other than a first-strike weapon and a system to ensure military superiority for the United States. In the event of its realisation the Soviet Union would have to take counter-measures," Vitaliy Shabanov, deputy minister of defence of the USSR, said in the TV programme.

"The orbiting of weapons is fraught with unpredictable consequences and with an outbreak of 'Star Wars' which would be fatal to mankind," emphasised Oleg Bykov, deputy director of the Institute of the World Economy and International Relations of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

"The SDI does not guarantee either national or international security. The way to a secure peace lies through strict observance of the 1972 ABM Treaty and through renunciation of the use of nuclear weapons both on earth and in outer space."

SDI Undermines 'Strategic Stability'

PM301142 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Nov 87 First Edition p 5

[Article by Candidate of Military Sciences Colonel V. Nazarenko: "SDI and Strategic Stability"]

[Text] Thanks to the USSR's major initiatives, the possibility of radically reducing and subsequently eliminating nuclear arms is emerging ever more clearly. The main obstacle on this path is still the so-called U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI).

The SDI program is aimed at creating sophisticated strategic arms designed to turn the nuclear missile triad into a four-component nuclear first-strike system by taking the strategic arms race into space. Scientific research and experimental design work with a view to creating a large-scale ABM system with space-based elements is taking on an increasing scale.

At first, all the research and experimental work took place on the basis of the concept of building a multiechelon system for ABM defense of U.S. territory, a system designed consistently and with a high degree of effectiveness to destroy strategic missiles (ICBM's and SLBM's) and nuclear warheads at all stages of flight to the target. The systems in each echelon, according to the intentions of the SDI program's authors, would independently carry out detection, tracking, recognition, interception, and destruction of missiles or warheads, with the potential for verification of the fact of destruction of the target. Soon, however, the program's leaders proposed a simplified version of ABM defense.

The overall intention of the new concept is as follows: The key role is assigned to the first echelon, which, it is proposed, would consist of a powerful grouping of space combat platforms (stations) equipped with light (up to 100 kg) antimissile missiles with heat-seeking homing heads capable of intercepting and destroying enemy ground- and sea-based strategic missiles in the active (boost) phase of their flight. It is planned to place these platforms in orbits at altitudes of between 400 and 500 km. The second echelon consists of ground-launched antimissile missiles which would destroy enemy ICBM and SLBM warheads outside the atmosphere in the descending phase of flight. In the third and last echelon of the ABM system, it is proposed to use antimissile missiles to destroy warheads of enemy ballistic missiles in the dense strata of the atmosphere.

The first stage of the deployment of the three-echelon ABM system, according to assertions of the SDI program's leaders, could begin as early as 1994. U.S. experts from the J. Hopkins Institute believe that the first echelon will include 1,335-1,915 space combat stations equipped with 65,000-95,000 light antimissile missiles. The cost of its deployment and maintenance in combat readiness for 10 years is estimated at $630-770 billion.

However, the administration has by no means taken off the agenda the problem of creating a large-scale ABM system with echelons of space weapons based on new physical principles. The abandonment, in the three-echelon system, of weapons systems based on guided energy transmission (laser and beam) is considered an enforced and temporary measure.

At present, within the SDI framework, scientific research and experimental work is continuing on creation of weapons known in the press as third-generation nuclear weapons. The first and second generations of such weapons are atomic and hydrogen weapons, which emit their energy spherically. Third-generation weapons will emit it in a directed way. U.S. experts regard as typical representatives of this generation of weapons nuclear-pumped X-ray lasers, and also nuclear microwave weapons with an intensified electromagnetic pulse. The Pentagon regards both as a basic component of the ABM system, as space strike weapons by means of which it is planned to destroy enemy strategic missiles, their warheads, and artificial earth satellites, and to take out particularly important targets on land and sea.

In terms of the range of operation, these weapons are global. Their placing in orbit would drastically increase the offensive might of the U.S. strategic triad. That could generate the temptation to use them as a means for a first, surprise strike in the hope of escaping with impunity, in the hope that a weakened retaliatory strike from the other side could be rebuffed with the help of the ABM system.

The development [razrabotka] of space strike arms in the United States wholly refutes widely publicized statements by high-ranking representatives of the administration on the supposed defensive, nonnuclear thrust of the SDI program. The main purpose of SDI, however they may camouflage it, is to achieve nuclear superiority over the Soviet Union. What they could not achieve over the decades through more and more new rounds of the nuclear arms race on earth, they now intend to obtain through use of sophisticated space technology.

Implementation of the SDI program would constitute a threat to the existing Soviet-American military-strategic parity.

The history of arms development shows that improving offensive and defensive means has always been an integrated process. The appearance of new forms of defense forces the opposite side to develop ways and means of overcoming them. In other words, creation and deployment of an U.S. space "spear," which is being passed off as an antimissile "shield," would rapidly lead to creation of the means of neutralizing and overcoming it, so as to preserve unchanged the potential for a retaliatory nuclear strike. All this would spur on the arms race not only in space but also on earth.

Not violating strategic stability in the existing military-political situation means renouncing plans to place strike weapons in outer space. Here there is an opportunity not only to preserve the present strategic parity, but also to create conditions for lowering its level. But by all appearances, the U.S. Administration has yet to show readiness to adopt political decisions with regard to the SDI program, and continues to gamble on creating a combined offensive-defensive disarming potential. This reliance on a "position of strength" cannot but cause concern.

The Soviet Union's approach to the problem of preventing an arms race in space is expressed, as is known, in a series of Soviet initiatives aimed at preventing the placing of weapons in space and eliminating all dangers associated with this trend. Back in August 1981, the USSR put forward a draft treaty banning the placing of any kind of weapon in outer space. In August 1983, a new Soviet initiative followed—a draft treaty banning the use of force in space or from space against earth. In February 1987, at the disarmament conference, the Soviet delegation put forward a proposal to adopt measures to ban weapons systems of the categories "space to space," "space to earth," and "earth to space."

Implementing SDI would be contrary to the ABM Treaty, which constitutes a system of guarantees of stability. If that treaty is adhered to for at least 10 years, this would guarantee stability on the basis of which it is possible to carry out a 50% reduction in strategic offensive arms and conduct constructive talks in future in the area of real disarmament. That is why this treaty must be retained and strictly complied with, in the Soviet side's firm conviction.

Thus, implementation of the SDI program would be a strong destabilizing factor leading to an increase in the danger of the outbreak of nuclear war. It is from these standpoints that the Soviet leadership approaches the range of nuclear and space arms problems.

Warsaw Pact's Kulikov Views INF, SDI, Baltic

PM251633 Oslo ARBEIDERBLADET in Norwegian 23 Nov 87 p 19

[NORSK TELEGRAMBYRA-FINSKA NOTISBYRAN report: "'Nuclear Arms Can Be Withdrawn'"]

[Excerpt] Helsinki—The commander in chief of the Warsaw Pact's forces, Soviet Marshal V.G. Kulikov, thinks that it is possible to remove all nuclear missiles from Europe. To achieve this a reduction in conventional weapons and forces in Europe is needed, the marshal said in an interview with the Finnish newspaper *Keskisuomalainen.*

In the interview, published yesterday, Kulikov also said that the U.S. space weapons plans are not invulnerable [usaarlige]. The Soviet Union has developed several countermeasures that are as effective as SDI, but not as expensive and not space-based, he said.

If the United States carries out its plans the Soviet Union will develop methods to deprive the SDI system of its advantages, Kulikov said.

The Soviet marshal said that there should be limits on the naval forces in the Baltic. The sea can no longer take the increases in the coastal states' navies. Kulikov said that the socialist states are ready to reduce the strengths of their navies, but that this would presuppose the sea being given nuclear-free status.

The marshal said that in practice the Nordic area already has nuclear-free status but that this should be enshrined in legal treaties. Under such a treaty the Nordic countries should promise not to make or stockpile nuclear arms, not to prepare to receive or receive nuclear arms, and not try to gain control of nuclear arms. Nor should it be permitted to transport nuclear arms through or over the countries, nor should any vessel with nuclear arms on board be allowed to enter the countries' ports. [passage omitted]

Kornilov Comments on U.S. Opponents of Treaty

LD271835 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1716 GMT 27 Nov 87

[By TASS Political Observer Yuriy Kornilov]

[Text] Moscow, 27 Nov (TASS)—And so, the USSR-U.S. diplomatic peace marathon is nearing the finish. The agreement of the draft treaty on total elimination of medium-range missiles and operational-tactical missiles is a fact. This means that conditions have been set up for emergence of the USSR and the United States on a qualitatively different level of cooperation in resolving the most important tasks common to all humanity.

The broad international public welcomes this turnabout, but it gives rise to a different, directly contrary reaction in the camp of those circles in the West, primarily in the United States, who are quite unable to renounce militarist dogmas. In the last few days, we have witnessed not only a positive process, but also a negative, alarming process: The more boldly and more decisively the obstacles and impediments to a treaty were removed at Geneva, the more actively the transatlantic opponents of an agreement got to work, and are still doing so. Today's *New York Times* announces those involved, naming conservative centers such as the "American Defense Committee," the "Coalition for Peace through Strength," the "Coalition for America," and the "American Conservative Union." The ranks of the opponents of the treaty include ultra-right senators and congressmen such as J. Kemp, J. Helms, and S. Symms. There are a few "has-beens" acting in unison with them—retired General D. Graham and former U.S. Secretary of State H. Kissinger, for example, who are effectively voting for confrontation to be continued.

This entire motley but highly bellicose and noisy army, closely linked to the U.S. military-industrial complex and the "arms kings," is expanding its destructive activity in several directions. It is known, for instance, that during the Geneva talks, the USSR has consistently demonstrated that it is willing to go equally as far in strengthening trust with the aid of reliable verification measures as the other side proves it is willing to go: Making mutual concessions gave an opportunity to develop measures enabling implementation of comprehensive verification of observance of the treaty. Such are the facts. But what are facts to opponents of the treaty! With an obstinacy worthy of better application, without even reading the treaty and with the backup of the CIA, they are terrifying people by alleging that there is no way to prevent the USSR from violating the treaty....

Meanwhile, the representatives of far-right forces are assiduously circulating claims to the effect that scrapping medium-range and operational-tactical missiles would "weaken NATO" and "breach" its defense. Hence the appeals to "upgrade" West European arms and flood the NATO bridgeheads on the European continent with new nuclear weapon carriers. Again and again, the militaristic concept that nuclear arms are practically heaven-sent to preserve world peace is uncritically recited.

Unprecedented measures are also being taken to publicize the ""Strategic Defense Initiative"" designed by Washington. As usual, they are attempting to justify that militaristic venture with fabrications about the "Soviet military threat." The Pentagon has urgently "presented" an opus called "The Soviet Challenge in Space," while the press, citing highest-ranking sources, is treating the man-in-the-street to "alarming" facts: In the USSR, they claim, there are no fewer than 10,000 qualified scientists and engineers working just on creation of military lasers. So that is how Washington's militaristic binoculars work. Peering through them from the U.S. shores at the Soviet Union, it turns out that one can not only count the number of specialists allegedly working on a "Soviet SDI", but even determine their qualifications....

"I believe in the agreement, but I hear peals of thunder", states Senator Ted Stevens, describing the situation. But, in reality, what the senator is referring to is more than that, I think. It is not peals of thunder, but the frenzied screeching of hawks, who have suddenly started to feel uncomfortable in their very sturdy—or so it had seemed to them—militaristic nests. It is difficult to avoid the impression that some people in Washington simply cannot come to terms with the very idea of a constructive turn in relations with the USSR, and especially with achievement of a really significant agreement on military security. This cannot fail to arouse caution and concern among both the Soviet and the international public.

Experts To Work 'Urgently' on Treaty Wording

LD272001 Moscow TASS in English 1612 GMT 27 Nov 87

[Text] Geneva November 27 TASS—BY TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Korzhev:

The reaching of the accord on the total elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles has coincided with the closing of the eighth round of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons, which continued for seven months on end.

Officially a break has been announced at the talks until January 14 next year when a new round will begin. Yet the experts of the two countries remaining in Geneva must urgently translate the agreements reached into precise formulas of an international treaty and ensure the authenticity of the Russian and English texts. All this should be completed within the next few days so that it be possible to sign the final draft in the course of the Soviet-American summit meeting scheduled to open on Dcember 7.

Kobysh Notes Significance of INF Accord

LD272036 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 27 Nov 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video talk by Political Observer Vitaliy Kobysh]

[Text] Good evening, comrades. A great event, a massive breakthrough, an historic agreement—such were the epithets with which the world reacted to the Soviet-U.S. agreement to eliminate medium- and shorter-range missiles. That is perfectly true. But let us, unemotionally and without misusing epithets, look at what has happened, or rather at the agreement by the USSR and the United States about what should happen.

In just a few days' time now, in effect, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev will arrive in Washington on 7 December. Of fundamental importance, in the first place, is the very fact of our two countries' agreement to eliminate nuclear missiles. This is the first such agreement in the history of the existence of nuclear weapons. In the second place, and this too is extremely important, two classes of nuclear weapons are to be destroyed at once for the first time. This, incidentally, came as a great shock to extreme rightwingers in the United States. In the third place, the agreement provides for effective verification [kontrol] measures, which some people thought impossible not so long ago. For the first time, it is planned to station representatives of the sides at the other side's production facilities—at the missile factories, in other words. This too gave rise to dissatisfaction, and even anger, among U.S. rightwingers.

And one further point. The agreement opens the way toward the further and considerably more radical destruction of nuclear weapons. Opponents of the agreement in the United States are well aware of this. That is why they are now doing everything possible to prevent its being signed, and will then do all they can to make its ratification by the U.S. Senate more difficult and, if possible, to wreck it.

This great cause arose from a hard struggle over many years. In fact, as we can see, the struggle is still going on. But even so, how did this agreement become possible? Why did the U.S. Administration decide to go for it? This is a big and difficult question.

The main thing, of course, is that the Americans realized that they could not hide away on the other side of the ocean, and, like all people on earth, they are afraid of nuclear warfare. The antinuclear movement that has arisen both in the United States and throughout the world came to be a material factor exerting a direct influence on the U.S. Administration. When, on 25 October this year, at the suggestion of the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace and the American Peace March organization, a wave of peace rolled across the whole world, there can be no doubt that it left its imprint both on the White House and Congress, and on other U.S. departments. The agreement that has been reached is a triumph for people's diplomacy. We have something like a pyramid: at the apex is the actual signing of the agreement, while below at the base, are thousands of millions of people who wish to live in peace—without nuclear weapons, without missiles, without fear or hatred. It is, thus, a common victory. It will also be necessary to jointly overcome the difficulties on the road toward a nonnuclear world, which will still, of course, be quite numerous.

Shultz Remarks on INF Treaty Quoted

LD292218 Moscow TASS in English 2156 GMT 29 Nov 87

[Text] New York November 29 TASS—TASS correspondent Vladimir Kikilo reports:

U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz has said the Reagan administration does not see any "particular problems" at the final stage of preparation for the signing of an INF treaty.

"When decisions are made you have to reduce it to precise treaty language," Shultz said in a CBS TV interview. "That's going on in a good way and there isn't any particular problem in that that I know of".

He said there was no chance of last-minute hitches and that all matters had been decided upon. "There really is not a problem. It's just a question of doing things, continuing to do things carefully and patiently and that's what we are doing".

Speaking of the prospect of concluding an agreement on a 50 per cent cut in the strategic arms of the United States and the Soviet Union, the U.S. secretary of state said the necessary quantitative ceilings had been specified at the summit meeting in Reykjavik.

He emphasised that the USA intended to continue work in this direction, proceeding from the Reykjavik accords.

Touching upon the problem of space weapons, which, as is generally admitted by experts, is the main obstacle to the conclusion of such a treaty, the U.S. secretary of state said that the U.S. position on that was clear: It would never go to a compromise in matters concerning U.S. ability to learn how to defend itself against ballistic missiles.

At the same time he did not rule out the possibility of a compromise concerning a period of time for non-withdrawal from the ABM Treaty which bans the deployment of such systems in outer space.

Mr Shultz said that one of the ways to ensure predictability and stability which both sides wanted was to have a period within which they should agree on non-withdrawal from the ABM Treaty.

Conventional Weapon Talks Continue in Vienna

LD301145 Moscow TASS in English 1128 GMT 30 Nov 87

[Text] Vienna November 30 TASS—A regular meeting was held here today as part of the consultations between the Warsaw Treaty and NATO to work out a mandate for the talks on reducing the armed forces and conventional weapons in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals. The sides continued to harmonise the provisions relevant to the objectives of the future talks and methods to accomplish them.

Yazov Returns From Bucharest; Met by Medvedev

PM300936 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Nov 87 First Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Return to Moscow"]

[Text] Bucharest, 26 Nov—Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, who headed the USSR Armed Forces delegation to the routine session of the Warsaw Pact Defense Ministers' Committee, left Bucharest for Moscow today.

He was seen off at the airport by Colonel General V. Milea, candidate member of the RCP Central Committee Political Executive Committee and Romanian minister of national defense, and other officials.

Ye.M. Tyazhelnikov, USSR ambassador to Romania, was among the sendoff party.

D.T. Yazov was met at Moscow airport by V.A. Medvedev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Army Gen P.G. Lushev, USSR first deputy defense minister; USSR deputy defense ministers Marshal of Aviation A.N.Yefimov, Army Gen M.I. Sorokin, and Army Gen D.S. Sukhorukov; and other officials.

I. Bucur, Romanian ambassador to the USSR, was among the welcoming party.

Conference Views World Socialism Problems

PM271201 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Nov 87 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Conference Held"]

[Text] A conference of leaders of Soviet scientific establishments working on problems of world socialism was held on 25 November. V.A. Medvedev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, delivered a report on urgent problems of cooperation among socialist countries at the contemporary stage and on the tasks of scientific research. Questions of scientific backup for relations with socialist countries as a priority direction of the CPSU's international activity were examined and discussed in light of the decisions of the 27th party congress and CPSU Central Committee plenums and of the political results of the celebrations for the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

Emphasis was placed on the importance of theoretical work to substantiate in depth the restructuring of the Soviet Union's relations with socialist countries and to update ideas on the place and role of socialism in today's integral and interdependent world.

The conference participants devoted special attention to questions of the living dialectics of the common natural laws and national features of socialism, to the characteristics of the contemporary stage in the socialist countries' cooperation, and to their political, economic, and ideological cooperation.

Note was taken of the importance of deepening and broadening scientific ties with the fraternal states' social scientists and also of substantially improving the system of training Soviet cadres employed on problems of the socialist world.

Participating in the exchange of opinions were Academicians O.T. Bogomolov, V.A. Vinogradov, A.G. Yegorov, Ye.M. Primakov, and T.S. Khachaturov; L.I. Abalkin, P.A. Nikolayev, and Yu.S. Shiryayev, corresponding members of the USSR Academy of Sciences; R.G. Yanovskiy, rector of the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences; and other comrades.

V.A. Grigoryev, chief of the CPSU Central Committee Science and Educational Institutions Department, participated in the conference's work.

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable'

LD292016 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 29 Nov 87

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Viktor Nikolayevich Levin, All-Union radio commentator; Vitaliy Ivanovich Kobysh, IZVESTIYA political observer; Nikolay Valdimirovich Shishlin, political observer]

[Text] [Levin] Esteemed comrades, hello! This week, as you know, there was a meeting in Geneva between Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs, and George Shultz, U.S. secretary of state, at which a Soviet-U.S. agreement on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles was finally coordinated. The way to this agreement was not an easy one—as you know, this year alone there have been four meetings between the heads of the foreign policy departments of the two countries—but now one can already say that this agreement is ready for signing during the visit to Washington by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, where he and President Reagan will—which, strictly speaking, there is no doubt- countersign this agreement.

[Shishlin] Viktor Nikolayevich, what we are speaking about is, of course, the key aspect of the upcoming visit, since for the first time a treaty will being signed which eliminates not just one, but two classes of nuclear missile weapons; for the first time, this treaty is backed by a very precise, strict and well-considered system of monitoring [kontrol] measures, a system of monitoring measures under which either side can be confident that no one will be violating the treaty.

However, it is the psychological aspects that are perhaps more important than the military aspects of this treaty, which is, incidentally, pretty voluminous—120 pages of text. This double-zero treaty is in itself a psychological break-through not only in Soviet-U.S. relations but also in international relations as such. It is in essence a new page opening up in the history of international relations. For the first time, after many long years of tension, long years of confrontation, after continuous tightening of the spiral of the arms race, steps in the reverse direction are being taken, steps towards a nonnuclear, nonviolent world. There is a long way to go, of course, a very long way, but the first step is in itself significant.

The agenda for the upcoming meeting between general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the President of the United States includes no few other problems, too, of course; and first and foremost the key issue of reducing strategic offensive weapons.

[Kobysh] Yes, and the significance of an accord on medium- and shorter-range missiles consists, as Nikolay Vladimirovich said, in that this is a psychological breakthrough which paves the way to further accords. Shultz said the other day that his negotiations with Comrade Shevardnadze on Geneva were a good way of limbering up for the next negotiations on strategic missiles, heavy missiles, that is. That's a good image. In principle, this is, so to speak, the start of the process of eliminating nuclear weapons; and the importance of this work can quite simply not be overestimated.

[Levin] While we are talking, here, about the significance of this agreement, we should also bear in mind that for the first time the question of monitoring [kontrol] and verification [proverka] has been successfully resolved, a question which in the past very often turned out to be a stumbling block. One should point out that on the U.S. side there has been a lot of speculation and reproaches against us in regard to this issue, and that the United States very often based their position on monitoring [kontrol] upon the allegation that the Soviet Union was failing to fulfil the obligations it had assumed and was violating, for example, the threshold agreement on nuclear tests, that the Soviet Union was violating the SALT I and SALT II agreements—many such charges were made. In connection with this I should like to cite just one example which I underlined in a report by the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Intelligence. This committee concluded that a large proportion of the evidence heard fails to corroborate the executive authority's statements to the effect that the Soviets have probably committed violations of treaties on tests. A scientist, a prominent U.S. Scientist, (Len) Sykes, from the Geological Observatory at New York's Colombia University, has also professed this opinion. He said the following: For over 10 years now I have been declaring that if you use several different methods to analyze Soviet tests, you will ascertain that there is no data testifying to any Soviet violations. This is a very important conclusion that confirms the Soviet Union really is strictly fulfilling the obligations it has assumed.

The question of monitoring [kontrol], however, of course goes beyond the bounds of these reproaches—it is a fundamental issue. It came as something of a surprise to the U.S. side when Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorabachev stated, ages ago now, that monitoring [kontrol] is for us no less important than it is for the U.S. side. This issue has now been embodied in a specific agreement. The U.S. press is already saying that U.S. inspectors [kontroler] will be at the gate of our plant in Votkinsk where, as they say, the SS-20's were manufactured; our inspectors will be at the gates of the plant in Utah, too, to monitor in the same way. The system of monitoring [kontrol], that is, is very wide. Our inspectors [kontroler], Soviet experts, will be able to carry out direct verification [proverka] at the Greenham Common and Molesworth bases in England, where U.S. cruise missiles are situated [razmeshchennyy]. We shall, that is, probably be briefed on the specific details after the agreement is signed, but one can already say now that a fundamentally important breakthrough has already been made in this sphere, too.

[Shishlin] The history of the breakthrough is itself interesting. The monitoring measures [mery kontrolya] will indeed be strict and all-embracing, and will be very profound, in accordance with the very scale of the treaty on elimination of medium and shorter-range missiles. As for the history of the monitoring [kontrol] issue, it is like this. You have just mentioned that as early as 2 years ago Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev spoke about the Soviet Union's readiness for the strictest and full-scale monitoring measures [mery kontrolya]. The Soviet Union was reproached for allegedly closing off its territory and not wishing to go for any broad-ranging monitoring measures. It emerged, however, that as soon as the Soviet Union expressed its readiness for monitoring measures [mery kontrolya] which were genuinely of full value to be worked out, the United States kept tripping up. President Reagan likes to repeat the expression—borrowed, incidentally, from the Russian vocabulary—have trust, but keep on checking [doveryay no proveryay].

[Kobysh] He learned it specially just recently!

[Shishlin] Yes, but we have absolutely no more trust in the Americans than they have in us, after all.

[Kobysh] We don't need to learn that phrase, we are in exactly the same situation. Incidentally, a very interesting thing was said by a man whose name is widely known, Richard Pipes. This Sovietologist is assumed to know everything and be able to pass opinions on everything, so to speak; when he found out that an accord of this sort had been reached on monitoring [kontrol], he said: I reckoned that at the last minute they — that is, the Russians — would raise objections against on-site inspections, and I still find it hard to believe it. It turns out that Richard Pipes does not know everything, and perhaps knows nothing at all, because it was actually the Americans who resisted. We went as far as was possible; but the Americans were afraid. Now the ultra-rightwingers in the United States are putting forward one argument against the treaty, namely that of monitoring measures [mery kontrolya]: from their point of view, they have gone too far. This is a wholly new situation.

[Shishlin] Yes, but let's move to the issue of reducing strategic offensive weapons. There is quite a broad range of opinions here regarding the prospects for drawing up an agreement. Those who doubt that such an agreement can be drawn up say that Reagan quite simply has little time. Others say that the positions of the sides are still pretty far apart. Yet others assert that it is such a sensitive problem that people are afraid to touch it.

Yet, in fact, one should not think that the talk in Washington will start from zero. First of all there was Reykjavik, where the accord in principle on the 50% reduction of strategic offensive arms was reached. There was some sort of understanding, however poor, that the reduction of strategic offensive arms was in itself conceivable only on the condition that the terms of the ABM treaty were strengthened. This is already a position, and an initial one. Furthermore, regarding the time limit—time is pressing, indeed, and whether we want it or not, the Presidential election will start, and all America will naturally switch over to this recurrent gripping battle on the political stage. But, given all these reservations, there is enough time, I think, to work out an agreement on the 50% reduction of strategic offensive arms and simultaneously to agree on strengthening the regime of the ABM treaty, especially as the Soviet Union has suggested a fairly clear and lucid formula of how to advance along this way. Indeed, we are suggesting not to touch the ABM treaty, but to keep it, and to voluntarily undertake not to depart from the treaty for a certain number of years, say for 10 years. That is all. At the same time, during the same peiod, to proceed towards the reduction of strategic offensive arms, and we are far from intending to stop on the threshold of the 50% reduction. The Soviet Union's goal is really to move toward a nuclear- and violence-free world, a world free of nuclear arms, but I think that one way or another, in this counterpoint of the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit, too, there is a wholly real possibility of progress.

[Levin] You have said, Nikolay Vladimirovich, that time is pressing. True, of course time is an essential factor, but I think you would agree that if there is political will the time factor will not play such an important role. When we speak about this we are taking into account that there is such will on the Soviet Union's side, without doubt. As for the United States, I would not want to dramatize the situation, but the fact remains that each time—and this time too, after the Geneva meeting between Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze and George Shultz—President Reagan, after saying some good words about the results of the meeting, came back to SDI once again. His repeated statements that SDI is the cornerstone of our strategy of security for the nineties and the following years reflects a certain position. Yet, at the same time, Reagan has been informed—this was reported by the U.S. press- that critics think that so many improvements are yet to be attained that the viability of the "Star Wars" system will not become clear before the next century. Many people maintain that the development [sozdaniye] of an impenetrable shield is on the whole impossible. According to astrophysicist Carl Sagan, even if trillions of dollars were spent it would be impossible to prevent Soviet missiles from penetrating U.S. territory. In other words, the issue of SDI is being criticized very sharply from a scientific point of view.

[Kobysh] Viktor Nikolayevich, it seems to me it is worth considering to whom President Reagan addresses those words. Far be it form me to appear in the role of Reagan's defender, let alone of SDI, yet he is now being put under extremely strong pressure from his alies of yesterday — and they are his allies today, too — those right-wingers or even ultra-right-wingers who are calling him either a compromiser of a traitor, and he reassures them with statements of that kind. They are addressed not so much to us—though maybe partly to us too—as to them. All the same there is a very complex process now underway in the United States. As a result Reagan seems to be almost a left-winger in this political game of patience that has emerged today in the United States.

[Shishlin] Well, a left-winger would be, probably, over the top.

[Levin] Yes, probably, probably. However, the situation is like that and one cannot but agree with that, one cannot but agree that he is trying to reasssure his opponents somehow, and the opponents are recoursing, I would say, to absolutely unseemly attacks on the administration. For example, I have read that certain critics of the administration are now maintaining that Shultz had no right to go for the agreement in Geneva and should not have done so, as he was bound by the announced term of the summit meeting and went for those excessive concessions under pressure of these time factors.

[Shishlin] But, Viktor Nikolayevich, the talk in Washington will be, however, not about SDI but precisely about deep reductions of strategic offensive arms and strengthening the regime of the ABM treaty. Touching upon the agenda for the talks, I think that discussion of what could be called Soviet-U.S. relations in their pure form will doubtless be prominent there. It is characteristic in this regard — we all are following what the U.S. press writes or what is being said from television screens or on the radio — that the picture is fairly mixed. That is, on one hand there are mass pronouncements in favor of the talks and mass publications welcoming Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's visit to the United States: Great hopes are being attached to this visit and good words are being said about an historic nature of this meeting. Yet, on the other hand, there are those forces mentioned by Vitaliy Ivanovich, right-wing or ultra-right wing circles which want quite simply to spoil this whole atmosphere; they are planning all sorts of anti-Soviet demonstrations and dragging out things that should have been long forgotten. From this viewpoint, of course, the upcoming discussion of Soviet-U.S. relations in itself presupposes that not only political issues, not only the issues of economic mutual relations between the two states—which are, by the way, simply negligible—not only contacts in the spiritual sphere, or contacts between people, but also what is called the moral climate in relations between the two states should come within the purview of the participants in the talks. The Soviet Union has no intention to teach the United States how it is to live or behave but, indeed, the Soviet Union is just as resolutely not prepared to listen to sermons from the U.S. on how it is to live, how to organize its society, how it is to develop or what it has to do.

[Kobysh] In any case, we have, of course, great difficulties in dealing with the Americans. We have been moving toward this agreement for many years, and now we have come to the point at last when it is to be signed by the leaders of the two countries. Now the question arises whether this agreement will be ratified by the U.S. Senate. We may find ourselves facing the problem of the Senate refusing to ratify it. It is very difficult to negotiate with a state like that. One has to overcome incredible difficulties and complexities along this way, as you can see. Moreover, there is purposeful work underway currently in the United States aiming at creating obstructions in the Senate such as would make it impossible to get the ratification through, in spite of the administration's assurances that it guarantees the ratification or, as Reagan put it, that he would be able to sell the accord to the Senate.

[Levin] Yes, but some facts indicate that there is an opinion in the Senate among a fairly important number of senators that yes, we will approve this accord but we will introduce amendments. But these amendments are obviously going to be one-sided, they will disturb the balance of interests that is reflected in the document. It is a very important point indeed. By the way, I shall come back to the Geneva meeting once again. Judging by its results, both the Soviet and U.S. sides said with good reason that a compromise had been reached. Both sides met half-way; we made certain concessions, the Americans made certain concessions, making it possible to work out the agreement. Whereas now, if anyone takes the floor in the Senate and says: You know, this seems wrong to me, and this become a matter of bargaining or, moreover, may become the basis of the document to be adopted by the Senate, then this situation is extremely worrying.

[Kobysh] Besides, the opponents of an accord or an agreement or any breakthrough altogether in this matter, so to speak, are planning, as far as is known, to adopt the tactics of an extremely slow discussion of this treaty in the Senate, a procedure of implementing procrastination tactics such as would make the ratification itself more complex, postpone it for an indefinite time and, in fact, scuttle the accord.

[Shishlin] But all the same one has to take into account the other aspect as well—that for the treaty to be ratified a two-thirds majority is needed in the Senate, and that according to present political arithmetic a few more than two-thirds of the senators support ratification of the treaty.

[Levin] I don't know, Nikolay Vladimirovich...

[Kobysh, interrupting] Nobody can know that.

[Levin] Senator Cranston, for example, gives the following figures. Admittedly he says that he does not undertake to affirm that the figures are precise, but he thinks that 50 members of the Senate take a positive view of the agreement on medium- and shorter-range missiles, about 23 senators will probably oppose it, and the rest have not yet decided. Yet 67 firm "yes" votes are needed, so that...

[Kobysh, interrupting] Cranston's is the voice of a fairly liberal senator, a man who takes a very benevolent view of the accord and wants it to be ratified.

[Shishlin] Here we are within an arm's length—less even—of the signing of the treaty, and we are already beginning to worry about how the U.S. Senate will handle it. Thank goodness none of us is questioning whether there is then any point at all in signing the treaty.

[Kobysh] I think that, nonetheless, a breakthrough is a breakthrough, and I think the very fact that a treaty is signed will affect not only people's outlook in the world, but the outlook in the United States and among U.S. legislators as well. Although the fact remains that a fairly acute and complex political struggle will be waged in the United States, I think, however, that this political struggle will be waged not only against the backdrop of the influences—the mutual influences of the military—industrial complex, the military lobbies, and various kinds of reactionary and ultraright-wing circles —but also against the backdrop of the changes taking place in the public outlook in the United States itself. Such changes are indeed taking place.

[Shishlin] Undoubtedly.

[Kobysh] The results of a public opinion poll have just been published, showing that 86% of the Americans polled expressed approval regarding the December summit meeting, and that 73% were in support of the idea of eliminating medium-range missiles in Europe, that is, in support of ratification—of signing and ratification. 73%! To ignore the will of the American people in this instance would demonstrate what a strange kind of democracy it is, because the view of the American people is perfectly obvious— the Americans want this treaty, they want nuclear weapons to be eliminated.

[Levin] I would add here that an analogous view is being expressed in Western Europe, too. The West German newspaper *General-Anzeiger*, which, to be blunt, is not left-wing— ery often, as, for example, in the debate over the Pershing-1A missile question, it has adopted stances which, from our point of view, are absolutely negative—but now, this same *General-Anzeiger* writes as follows: If the Senate creates obstacles to ratification of the Soviet-U.S. agreement and drags things out, this will inflict damage to progress in the sphere of disarmament. This is another very earnest conclusion, a conclusion clearly bearing witness that there is an understanding in Western Europe of the need for this agreement. Incidentally, there has been a lot of talk about the West Europeans allegedly not being too keen on eliminating Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles. Some have put it this way: They have nothing against the elimination of Soviet missiles, but would like the U.S. umbrella to remain, as it is claimed. But even the meeting between Shultz and representatives of the NATO powers in Brussels showed that they all support the agreement. Since we're on the subject of the NATO bloc's stance, I think there would be no harm in recalling once again the stance of the Warsaw Pact, as expressed at the sitting of Warsaw Pact Defense Ministers Committee. At the sitting unanimous approval was expressed on the agreements reached between the USSR and the United States on medium- and shorter-range missiles as the first real step along the road of destroying nuclear arsenals while preserving equilibrium in armed forces and weapons at a lower level. The participants in the sitting also spoke in favor of reaching an accord as soon as possible on a 50% reduction of strategic offensive weapons by the two sides.

[Shishlin] It's a good thing you've brought up this subject, Viktor Nikolayevich, because the Soviet-U.S. double-zero treaty—let's call it that for the moment—is not only a Soviet-U.S. affair, it is genuinely of vital interest and concern to the world public, of concern to Western Europe, of concern to...

[Levin, interrupting] The whole of mankind.

[Shishlin] ...the countries in the Far East, and the entire world community, in essence. Therefore, when we talk both about the forthcoming summit meeting and about possible subsequent Soviet-U.S. agreements, we have to realize that the other members of the world community will not be such passive participants in that Washington dialogue: They are following what is going to happen in Washington and what the outcome of the Washington meeting will be with a vested interest. Even today we can see the dynamics of the development of international relations, marked by such milestones as Geneva, autumn 1985; Reykjavik, autumn 1986; and now December of the current year, 1987. That is to say, the axle of the development of international relations has shifted by itself, the growth of international tension has been halted, and the dialogue has not only been intensified, but is becoming more productive and more successful. Of course this will not stop at the appearance of new positive elements in Soviet-U.S. relations. It's a question of inserting these much-needed elements of trust into international relations as a whole; it's a question of creating a political climate in which far more significant and far more far-reaching decisions could come within reach.

[Levin] Here, I think, it would be worth directing attention to the fact that, notwithstanding the significance of the development of Soviet-U.S. relations, the Soviet Union has this very week demonstrated its striving to conduct this active, peace-loving foreign policy literally in every area. Let's recall the events of these last few days: Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's meeting, and Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko's talks, with the Portuguese President Soares; Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov's visit to India; Zambian President Kaunda's visit to the Soviet Union. Just take a look—several strands are being charted out at once. Whereas with Soares it was principally a question of the European strand, of Europe's role in the development of world processes, the visit to India — a visit which coincided with such a very important date as the anniversary of the Delhi Declaration on a nuclear-free and nonviolent world, signed by Mikhail

Sergyevich Gorbachev and Rajiv Gandhi a year ago—is a reflection of the coinciding foreign policy courses of the Soviet Union and a great country like India. Finally, there's the African strand reflected in the visit by Kaunda. Thus, it's the breadth of the Soviet Union's actions and their vigor that show that the world is indeed changing, and we are by no means placing all our eggs in one basket, as the Americans say. Yes, there is no doubt that Soviet-U.S. relations are a very important element, but the other strands of foreign policy activity are no less important. A truly secure world can be created only through joint effort by all states and all peoples.

[Shishlin] I think we can already say that the new political thinking, which the Soviet leadership has frequently said needs to be firmly established, this new political thinking is clearing a path for itself in international political practice. Moreover, it is beginning to produce results. It is in this that the value of the present moment lies, the tremendous potentialities contained in the present development of international relations. This is to say, the new political thinking is not only a philosophy of peace, but also a program of action in the name of peace for today, for tomorrow, and for all time.

[Levin] And that brings our broadcast to an end. All the best, esteemed comrades. Goodbye.

Gorbachev Greets International Conference

LD300929 Moscow TASS in English 0852 GMT 30 Nov 87

[Text] Moscow November 30 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has addressed cordial greetings to the participants in the international conference "Peoples of the World Against Apartheid, for Democratic South Africa." The conference is scheduled to be held in Arusha from December 1 to 4.

"The Soviet Union has invariably stood up for and continues standing up for the South African patriots fighting for freedom and justice, against oppression and lack of rights," Mikhail Gorbachev pointed out. "Today this struggle has assumed a truly nation-wide character. Marching in its vanguard is the African National Congress — the true exponent of the interests of the People of South Africa. Various mass anti-racist organizations are ever more vigorously acting in the country. It is indicative that the number of white people among the opponents of apartheid is growing.

The Soviet people meet with full understanding and support the noble aim placed to themselves by the freedom fighters — of building in South Africa a united, democratic, non-racial state. We also resolutely demand an end to the unlawful occupation of Namibia by the Pretoria regime. Nobody will be able to reverse the course of history. Apartheid is doomed. Neither terror nor aggression against the "Frontline" African states or the patronage by the reactionary imperialist circles will serve it."

Mikhail Gorbachev wished successful work to the participants in the conference. He expressed confidence that it will make an important contribution to strengthening international solidarity with the courageous fight of the South African people for the liberation of their homeland.

UN Distributes Joint Memorandum on Security

PM261231 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Nov 87 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Sukhoy dispatch: "Vital Task. Socialist Countries' Memorandum at the United Nations"]

[Text] New York, 24 Nov—The socialist countries, joint authors of the initiative to create an all-embracing system of international peace and security, have distributed a joint memorandum on this question at the United Nations.

The document points out that civilization is now at a crucial stage of its development. Dangers have emerged, primarily the nuclear missile danger, which place in jeopardy the very existence of mankind. In these conditions there is a need for a concept of peace and security which would offer reliable guarantees for mankind's survival and would make it possible to build a world free from nuclear weapons, violence and hatred, fear and suspicion. Priority in this must be given to universally recognized human values, while peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems must become a universal principle of international relations.

The realities of today's interlinked and interdependent world demand the creation of a mechanism capable of pursuing the quest for balance between the contradictory but vital interests of all states and nations and the entire international community. The socialist countries are convinced that the United Nations is called upon to play the role of such a mechanism.

An opportunity exists now to effect a decisive turnabout away from the dangerous and ruinous arms race toward stage-by-stage disarmament. For the first time in history, there has been success in reaching agreement in principle between the USSR and the United States on the elimination of two classes of missile weapons—medium-range and operational-tactical missiles. It is necessary to move further along this avenue, toward the conclusion of a convention banning chemical weapons and accord on a 50% reduction of strategic arms while preserving the ABM Treaty. It is also important to ensure that the elimination of some types of arms is not accompanied by a buildup of other arms or the creation [sozdaniye] of new types of weapon.

The peaceful settlement of existing regional conflicts and the prevention of the emergence of new ones is a most important component of an all-embracing security system. Broader use must be made of the institution of UN military observers and armed forces for the purpose of preventing the growth of disputes into crisis situations.

The socialist countries believe that more effective collective measures are necessary to solve the world's economic problems and to establish a new international economic order.

Genuine security is impossible to achieve unless human life is recognized as the supreme asset, unless elementary conditions exist for the balanced development of personalities. In this context the memorandum points out that the establishment of a humanitarian civilized world is impossible without guaranteed basic rights and individual freedoms, and without the democratization of states' domestic life in accordance with their specific features and tasks. The document contains a proposal on the elaboration of a global strategy for environmental protection and rational utilization of natural resources which takes into account the entire package of present and future ecological problems.

Insofar as an all-embracing system of international peace and security organically stems from the UN Charter, its effectiveness will depend directly on the extent to which the Security Council, General Assembly, and other UN institutions function efficiently.

The memorandum says that the socialist countries' joint initiative is an invitation to UN member states to exchange opinions on the ways and means for ensuring universal security. The document expresses the hope that this initiative will materialize and be developed through joint efforts by all United Nations.

'All-Embracing System' Sought

PM251325 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Nov 87 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "United Nations: Socialist Countries' Memorandum"]

[Text] New York, 24 Nov—On Monday socialist countries submitted a joint memorandum in the United Nations on the question of creating an all-embracing system of international peace and security. The document says that the world is at a decisive turning point in its history. Dangers have arisen—first and foremost the nuclear danger—which call into question mankind's very existence.

Under these conditions the ensuring of each state's security needs to be approached in a way that does not create the threat of universal catastrophe. A concept of peace and security is needed that gives reliable guarantees for mankind's survival and facilitates the building of a world free from nuclear weapons, violence and hatred, fear and suspicion. The transition to a nonnuclear, nonviolent, and ultimately demilitarized world is a historical necessity which really can be put into practice. A necessary condition for universal security is unfailing observance of the UN Charter and of the peoples' right to the sovereign choice of their own paths and forms of development; the political and moral core of that security is states' and peoples' trust in one another and honest implementation of international agreements.

The socialist countries stressed that an all-embracing system of security can only be ensured by the collective efforts of the entire world community with all its members being equal. In the modern interconnected and interdependent world the demand for a mechanism for jointly seeking balance among the various contradictory yet real interests of the modern community and of states and nations is becoming increasingly acute. The United Nations is designed to be that mechanism.

The memorandum notes that there is now the real possibility of effecting a radical turn away from the dangerous and wasteful arms race toward phased disarmament. For the first time in history an accord in principle has been secured between the USSR and the United States on the elimination of two classes of their nuclear armaments—medium- and shorter-range missiles. An understanding on halving strategic armaments while retaining the ABM Treaty is to follow. It is important to provide guarantees that the elimination of certain types of arms is not accompanied by the buildup of others or by the creation of weapons based on new physical principles.

The growing interconnection and interdependence of the world, in the socialist countries opinion, prompts the application of more vigorous collective efforts on the basis of the UN Charter to resolving world economic problems and establishing a new international economic order.

Human life must be deemed the supreme value, and conditions for the individual's harmonious development must be guaranteed. In this connection, it is necessary to elaborate a forward-looking program for cooperation among states to establish a humane, civilized world by ensuring everywhere the fundamental rights and freedoms of the individual and the democratization of states' internal life in accordance with their particular features and the tasks which they set for the future, and to establish trust, harmony, and cooperation among them on this basis.

An all-embracing system of international security also presupposes the elaboration of a global strategy for environmental protection and the rational use of natural resources.

The initiative on creating an all-embracing system of international peace and security is an invitation to the UN member states and the world public to exchange opinions on ways and means of ensuring it. The socialist countries expressed the hope that the idea of all-embracing security will be developed and concretized by the international community's joint efforts at the 42d UN General Assembly session.

Petrovskiy: All-Important Idea

LD281040 Moscow TASS in English 1011 GMT 28 Nov 87

[Text] New York November 27 TASS—TASS correspondent Vyacheslav Chernyshev reports:

The USSR delegation at the 42nd U.N. General Assembly session today gave a press conference in view of the completion of the debates at the session on the issue of a comprehensive system of international security. The debates that involved the delegations of 68 countries were capped with the approval by the first committee of the General Assembly of a draft resolution tabled by the group of socialist states.

This is a document of great political importance, said Vladimir Petrovskiy, deputy foreign minister of the USSR. It expresses the conviction in the need to continue and deepen a broad democratic dialogue on the issues of international security, to use new organizational forms of such a dialogue, and charges U.N. secretary-general with a respective mission.

What is all-important is that a concept of comprehensive security, providing for ensuring it by peaceful political means, on an equal footing and an [as received] in all areas of international relations was formulated and approved in the form of the United Nations decision.

This document is an expression of the will of the U.N. member states to act in present-day conditions from the positions of a new mode of political thinking, to introduce in the practice of international relations a new mode of action and style of states' conduct, certainly on the bases of scrupulous observance of the U.N. Charter.

UN'S Perez de Cuellar on USSR-U.S. Agreement

LD260030 Moscow TASS in English 2013 GMT 25 Nov 87

[Text] New York November 25 TASS—The U.N. secretary-general has expressed his profound gratification with the talks between USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz concerning the draft treaty on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles, a spokesman for Javier Perez de Cuellar said today. He recalled that the U.N. secretary-general had repeatedly voiced hope that the USSR and the USA would avail themselves of the opportunities which the signing of this history-making document will create so as to conduct with fresh vigour talks on other disarmament issues.

More on Rogachev Briefing: Japanese Ties

LD271725 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1111 GMT 27 Nov 87

[Text] Moscow, 27 Nov (TASS)—Tension is unfortunately continuing to increase in the Asian-Pacific region. This conclusion was reached by the sides at the Soviet-Japanese political consultations held recently in Tokyo. This was stated today by USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev.

At the consultations, he told a press conference at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center, the emphasis was on the state of Soviet-Japanese relations. The Soviet side drew attention to the fact that the new leaders of Japan have made a series of statements in which they express their intention of setting right Soviet-Japanese relations. The point is that in recent times, and specifically in 1987, a period of cooling has set in in these relations, and it is now possible to discern a clear striving on both sides to put an end to this state of affairs as soon as possible. An improvement of Soviet-Japanese relations would facilitate a better general climate in Asia and the Pacific region.

We hope, the deputy minister said, that Japan will also make its constructive contribution to solving conflict situations.

Judging by the statements of our Japanese counterparts during our stay in Tokyo the new Japanese leadership has welcomed the coming summit meeting between the leaders of the the USSR and the United States, welcomed the forthcoming signing of a treaty on eliminating medium-range and shorter-range missiles, and has expressed its confidence that an improvement of Soviet-Japanese relations will have a favorable effect on the entire international climate, on the situation in Asia and the Pacific region, and in particular on Soviet-Japanese relations. We consider such an assessment to be fair and are ready to share it, Igor Rogachev said.

ICFTU Chairman on Talk With Gorbachev

PM251345 Moscow TRUD in Russian 20 Nov 87 p 3

[Interview with P. P. Narayanan, chairman of the ICFTU, specially by TASS correspondent S. Bychkov under the rubric "International Trade Union Movement": "Improving Mutual Understanding"]

[Text] Kuala Lumpur, Nov—The ICFTU delegation at M. S.Gorbachev's meeting with the ICFTU leadership was headed by P.P. Narayanan (Malaysia), chairman of the organization. At *Trud*'s request S. Bychkov, TASS correspondent in Malaysia, asked the ICFTU chairman to give his impressions of the meeting. The text of the interview is published below.

[Bychkov] How did the idea of organizing a meeting between the confederation leaders and the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee arise?

[Narayanan] Back in May 1986 the ICFTU Executive Committee decided to set up a special committee for the struggle for peace, security, and disarmament, which are necessary preconditions for the success of the movement to improve working people's working and living conditions. It drew up an action program which included organizing discussions with international leaders. Meetings had already been held between ICFTU delegates and UN and NATO leaders. Now a meeting was being held with the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Future meetings are planned with U.S. President R. Reagan and certain leaders of neutral countries.

[Bychkov] What aims did the ICFTU delegation set itself in coming to the Moscow meeting?

[Narayanan] Briefly, the ICFTU wanted to put forward the viewpoint of its component trade unions on the problems of maintaining peace, to discuss the prospects for safeguarding the peoples' security and ensuring disarmament and arms control, and to exchange opinions about the future of the United Nations, human rights, and the trade union movement. As you can see, the questions of the struggle for peace were spotlighted. If there is peace, the trade unions will have successes in their struggle on other fronts. If peace is not ensured it will be impossible to count on achievements in protecting working people's interests. Comrade Gorbachev opened the meeting by saying that he was prepared to sign almost all the basic provisions set out in the ICFTU's official statements on disarmament problems. He said that he would like to openly and directly talk about general concerns without repeating what was set out in the preparatory documents. These words immediately created an informal and good atmosphere for exchanging opinions.

Comrade Gorbachev gave full and detailed answers to all our questions and proposals, and set out in detail the Soviet Union's position on the problems under discussion. A complete report on the content of the meeting will be presented for examination by the ICFTU Executive Committee in December. It is too early to draw any clear-cut conclusions, since opinions were exchanged on many complex questions, but it can already definitely be said that we are satisfied with the attention which Comrade Gorbachev paid to our idea for a meeting and the frankness of his approach to the questions that were discussed.

[Bychkov] What was your strongest impression of the meeting?

[Narayanan] I was struck most of all by the new Soviet approach to disarmament problems set out by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, the Soviet leader's adherence to new international thinking, and the cause of ensuring the success of the changes currently taking place in Soviet society, the success of restructuring, and the development of glasnost.

[Bychkov] What, in your opinion, will be the practical consequences of the Moscow meeting for the struggle for peace and the development of the trade union movement?

[Narayanan] I do not want to jump the gun. I must discuss the results of the meeting with the members of the ICFTU Executive Committee. We still have to complete the series of meetings we have begun. Talks are planned with U.S. President R. Reagan. However, it is already obvious that the Gorbachev meeting was exceptionally useful, if only because it was the first direct dialogue between a Soviet leader and ICFTU representatives. I must say that before the talks at the CPSU Central Committee we had been cooperating with Soviet trade union [illegible]ntatives within the framework of the ILO. Ther[illegible] no political boundaries between us. The re[illegible]r unity of actions should be: Does this unity [illegible]ld's working people? If it does, then we m[illegible] at regional conferences and at wor[illegible]

Foreign M[illegible]CE Anniversary

LD262240 [illegible]ish 1938 GMT 26 Nov 87

[Text] Moscow November 26 TASS—A TASS diplomatic correspondent reports:

In the present complex international situation, the process of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) is a factor of stability which cushions many of the negative phenomena and tendencies which arise in international affairs, said chief of the department for questions of security and cooperation in Europe at the USSR Foreign Ministry Yuriy Deryabin. Today he answered questions from a TASS diplomatic correspondent in connection with the 15th anniversary of the beginning of the European process that falls due this month.

Yuriy Deryabin said the unique nature of the European process imparts a democratic character to it. This process enables all countries, large and small, regardless of their participation or non-participation in military-political alliances, to join on an equal footing in a dialogue and joint measures. This leads to a marked increase of the role of neutral and non-aligned countries in Europe and also, for the first time in European history, in decisions on military aspects of security in the continent.

The Soviet Union and other socialist countries consistently declare in favour of these important matters being discussed with participation of all the 35 countries participating in CSCE. Security in Europe is indivisible. Problems of disarmament have a direct bearing on the vital interests of security, the interests of survival in the nuclear-space age of all the states of the continent, large and small, involved or uninvolved in military-political alliances.

The Vienna meeting which opened in conditions of the new period the beginning to which was set in Reykjavik holds an important place in the European process. The Vienna meeting is called upon to show that Europe is capable of taking vigorous, undelayed actions, of speeding up the corse of events in the world, channelling them into the route of new politcal thinking.

The Helsinki Final Act in many aspects as if foresaw new political thinking in Europe. The first sprouts of new thinking, such as the Stockholm accords on confidence-building measures in the military area, appeared on its soil. On the order of the day now is a transition, and precisely in the framework of the European process, to real disarmament, to the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments. This must apply to such most destabilising, offensive types of arms as tactical nuclear weapons, as "dual-purpose" weapons.

New thinking must also be manifested in such an important area, reflected in the final act, as the humanitarian area. The Soviet proposal for the holding of a conference on humanitarian questions in Moscow does not mean a claim to solving all problems of cooperation in this area. Mutual accord on a number of such problems could be found at the Vienna meeting itself, and some of these problems could be discussed at other European forums. What is important in the long run is such accords as could help improve the state of affairs in the humanitarian area in all the countries participating in the European process.

The process of the further democratisation, glasnost, perestroyka, now implemented in all the spheres of the life of Soviet society undoubtedly promote the achievement of these aims, Yuriy Deryabin said in conclusion. New political thinking in questions of humanitarian cooperation, just as in other spheres of international security, is required also from Western countries. This is the basis of the success of the European process.

Daily on Restructuring of Foreign Policy

PM251635 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 24 Nov 87 Second Edition p 3

[Vladimir Katin article under the rubric "We Answer Readers": "Under the Influence of the New Thinking"; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Our readers A. K. Karasev from Novosibirsk, V. I.Matveyeva from Saratov, and others write to the editorial office that, in their opinion, the press and television do not feature restructuring in foreign policy as noticeably as changes in internal life. Readers ask: Why is this: because of the very nature of international themes or something else?

Restructuring has by no means missed the sphere of foreign policy. However, we must look carefully at how matters stand here and why there is a stream of letters asking roughly the same questions.

Speaking at the celebrations to mark the 70th anniversary of Great October, M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, admitted: "Of course, not all our foreign policy work subsequently consisted of successes and achievements alone. There were also miscalculations.... Our reaction to imperialism's provocative actions was not always adequate."

Thus there are reproaches to be made of our diplomacy. USSR Foreign Minister E. A. Shevardnadze, in particular, thinks that warning signals were not sounded in time regarding our lag in the scientific and technical revolution, the structural reorganization in the world economy was not forecast, nor were warnings issued regarding the one-sided passion for trade in energy sources. "The fact that the foreign policy service," he said, "one of the most important, most sensitive links in the state management system, performed its duties in isolation from the country's fundamental vital interests is on our conscience."

This—in a nutshell—is the critical side to the evaluation of Soviet diplomacy's past activity. What is the present situation?

At the present stage the task has been set as follows: Foreign policy must ensure favorable conditions for resolving the state's internal problems. We need first and foremost peace and peaceful living conditions in order to boost the economy and the people's prosperity and standard of living. Therefore Soviet diplomacy's activity is also channeled toward seeking the shortest routes to limiting and reducing military rivalry, removing confrontational situations in relations with other states, and damping down conflicts.

When I met with a group of Mexican journalists recently I noticed that they were particularly interested in the following problem: while proclaiming the need for new thinking, how is the Soviet Union itself guided by this in its foreign policy?

This restructuring is already under way—both in the theoretical approach to problems of world development and also in practical actions in the international arena. Take the concept of peaceful coexistence—Originally this concept was based above all on the need to create favorable external conditions for building a new society in the land of the soviets. In the nuclear age the possibility of universal catastrophe makes peaceful coexistence a factor in the struggle for universal survival. Now it is not only in the interest of the working classes that won victory in Russia but in the interest of all mankind, which goes beyond class interest.

Thus the emergence of the problem of the survival of the human race in connection with the threat of the use of nuclear weapons has changed the concept, adapting it to new historical conditions. Its starting point is the following idea: Despite the profoundly contradictory nature of the modern world and the fundamental differences between its component states, it is interlinked and mutually dependent and constitutes an integral whole.

Nevertheless the threat of nuclear war remains. Can mankind be pulled back from the edge of the abyss where it finds itself now? This question, judging by letters to the editorial office perturbs practically everyone.

Most important of all is that—for the first time in the long history of disarmament talks—there will be a real reduction in weapons. Our program for nuclear disarmament through the year 2000 was a tremendous event. The inhabitants of various parts of the globe ardently welcomed it, although, of course, there are also people who oppose our impressive plan.

A certain positive development of events to fulfill this program has already emerged. A specific example is the accord in principle between the USSR and the United States to conclude a treaty on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles. This is to take place during M.S. Gorbachev's visit to Washington, which the world public is now awaiting with such impatience.

This accord, which is of extremely great importance, is being implemented thanks to the Soviet Union's consistent and principled policy. Our country has agreed to destroy all its missiles of the two classes in Europe and Asia, while leaving to one side the British and French nuclear forces. Previously we considered these forces to be part of the overall balance of NATO nuclear armaments in Europe. The newness of the approach to the problem is also expressed in the credit of trust which our country has granted London and Paris.

Thus in the course of restructuring Soviet foreign policy is acquiring greater flexibility and is demonstrating its desire to seek ways out of impasses and find compromises. The upcoming destruction of more than 2,000 nuclear warheads has been evaluated by the most diverse countries as a historic event.

However, there are also doubts. During my recent meetings in Prague and Bratislava Czech and Slovak friends were worried by the question: Will we, the socialist countries, not be weaker after the destruction of the Soviet missiles on which we are now reaching agreement with the Americans? No, we will not be weaker. For an entire two classes of missiles—the Pershing-2 and cruise missiles targeted on us—are being eliminated. Moreover, their flight time to Soviet territory is 4-6 minutes, whereas the flight of an ICBM for a retaliatory strike on U.S. territory would take a good 30 minutes.

Now I will answer the question of Mariya Vekshinaya from Moscow, who asks whether people in the West are joining in the new political thinking. In the United States and other countries of the Western world this term is not generally highly thought of and they try not to use it—or they say that it is an invention of Moscow and Soviet propaganda. But, in fact, as we can see, the new political thinking is blazing itself a trail through the barriers of prejudice, bias, and enmity. This is manifested specifically in the accord between the USSR and the United States on missiles and warheads, the intention to halve strategic offensive armaments, and the start of Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva on banning nuclear tests.

Incidentally, let me note that the problem of verification was the stumbling block in nuclear arms reduction and disarmament talks for a long time. The Americans did their utmost to get the Soviet Union to agree to a form of on-site verification, which we considered unacceptable. The incumbent Soviet leadership's turn toward more openness in policy has also changed this seemingly chronically frozen situation. It is well known that we advocate strict verification, and when we hear talk about the need for double verification, we answer that the USSR advocates triple verification.

This new USSR approach toward the problem of verification has shown that the United States was simply bluffing in its insistence on strict verification. Now that the Soviet side has met them halfway, the Americans have begun to abandon their positions and have lost all interest in the verification question. As a result, it turns out that the Soviet Union favors more efficient reliable verification while the United States is trying to duck out of it and is creating new obstacles.

The new sign of restructuring—the glasnost and openness of Soviet foreign policy—is shown in concrete actions. Suffice it to recall that this fall, at the request of the U.S. side, an inspection group of U.S. military experts visited the area in Belorussia where Soviet troop exercises took place, or that a delegation of U.S. Congressmen was permitted in September to visit the radar station under construction in Krasnoyarsk and receive all necessary information about it.

The fact that briefings and press conferences are also held in such a frank manner is also revealing. For instance, briefings at the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Moscow have become a permanent channel for contact between Soviet diplomats and accredited foreign journalists.

While enshrining in fact and in practice the principles of new political thinking in foreign policy, our country is by no means rejecting other people's ideas solely because they come from other people. We are prepared to discuss them and adopt them if they are at all rational. Therefore Moscow invites states with a different system and their leaders to show the same attitude toward ideas emanating from the country of the Soviets. Today the key idea of our foreign policy is to ensure equal security for everyone, for we are all closely interlinked in this world in which we are destined either to live together or to die together. There is no third option.

Correction to 'Top Priority' on Summit, INF

Moscow in English for North America at 2300 GMT on 25 November broadcast a a repeat of the 'Top Priority' program run in the 25 November Soviet Union *Daily Report* page 12, under the headline "'Top Priority' on INF Treaty, Upcoming Summit." Comparison of the two broadcasts allows for the following fills to indistinct portions:

Page 12, column two, paragraph two, sentence one: ...it's a problem of the common logic of the arms race, I would say,... (clearing indistinct words)

Page 13, column two, paragraph five, sentence three, line six: ...say again political situation. You know...

[Pozner, interrupting] Yes, definitely.

[Molishenko]...it would really change the world because... (clearing indistinct words)

Page 13, column two, last paragraph, sentence three, line four: ...have done now, we have, some people say we have sacrificed, I say no, we have demonstrated a ... (clearing indistinct words)

Page 13, column two, last paragraph, sentence four, line seven: ...you have a correlation of four to one for missiles, four warheads to, Soviet warheads to one missile, so... (clearing indistinct words)

Page 14, column one, paragraph two, sentence one: ...Your advantage and you should stick to your advantage — no,... (changing "speak" to "stick")

Page 14, column one, paragraph eight, sentence two, line four: ...and not only our public, by the way, and American public as well should...(clearing indistinct words)

Page 14, column two, paragraph nine, sentence two, line ten: ... governments but between two societies as well, and it's very important and (?that's why) I would... (changing "quite" to "very")

PRAVDA Editorial Article on Arms Limits

PM271627 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Nov 87 First Edition p 1

[Editorial article: "Key Issue. Fundamental Cuts in Strategic Offensive Weapons Are Possible Given Observance of ABM Treaty"]

[Text] On the eve of the Washington summit between the Soviet and U.S. leaders mankind is full of hope and expectation for a turn for the better in world development and safer times ahead. The drawing up, despite enormous obstacles, of the treaty on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles has again shown that nuclear disarmament is possible and realistic. The signing of this historic treaty will be a concrete step along this rocky but promising road. The peoples welcome the good news and the important landmark.

The logic of the new political thinking naturally poses the question of what lies ahead—a peace "chain reaction." This question will undoubtedly be present in the Washington dialogue too. In this regard the world quite obviously expects progress on the key issue of ending the arms race—the question of radical cuts in strategic offensive means and the prevention of weapons in space—from the meeting between the leaders of the two great powers, who for a number of reasons bear a special responsibility for the survival of the human race.

The urgency of focusing efforts in this direction is obvious. Strategic arms account for almost 96% of the two main nuclear powers' nuclear explosives. It is well-known that this is enough to destroy all life on earth "several times over." The need for the resolute reduction and subsequent complete elimination of strategic offensive weapons is dictated by their terrible sophistication and the plans to switch the arms race to near-earth space, which would whip up the arms race on earth even more.

Recognizing its responsibility for the fate of civilization, the Soviet Union has proposed a clear-cut timetable for movement toward a secure world. This program was formulated in the well-known statement of 15 January 1986. This historic document was the starting point for our country's practical actions in all directions of arms limitation and disarmament, and primarily in the most important area—nuclear and space weapons. The phased program for the elimination of nuclear and other types of mass destruction weaponry by the year 2000 is an organic part of the concept put forward by the 27th CPSU Congress for the formation of a comprehensive international security system. It opened up the real prospect of averting a global catastrophe and reinforced people's awareness of the fact that a nuclear-free world is attainable.

The nature of modern weaponry leaves no state any hope of defending itself by military or technical means. The old dogma "more weapons means more security" is groundless. Today the safeguarding of security is presented more and more as a political task which can only be solved by political means. This was the Soviet Union's line in Geneva. The program advanced by the USSR to rid mankind of the threat of nuclear annihilation was further developed and fleshed out during the Soviet-U.S. summit in Reykjavik. It was from that vantage point that the glimmerings of a nonnuclear world first appeared.

In Reykjavik the USSR proposed halving strategic offensive weapons in the course of 5 years and totally eliminating them in the future provided that the ABM Treaty, which is the guarantee of strategic stability, is strengthened. However, agreement was hampered by the U.S. Administration's adherence to the SDI program. Nonetheless, the meeting, at which the two great powers for the first time got extremely close to an agreement on radical nuclear arms cuts, was of very great importance. Reykjavik helped to make political relations more dynamic and was a real breakthrough. It ensured a rising trend in the development of Soviet-U.S. dialogue and made it possible to reach the current level of the examination of issues.

The world can see the serious efforts made by the Soviet Union in this sphere. It recently took another important step. Since the question of reducing strategic offensive arms is closely linked with the problem of the nonplacement of weapons in space, the USSR submitted additional specific proposals for the purpose of finding outcomes satisfying both sides. Their essence is as follows: The United States agrees to legally enshrine the pledge not to take advantage of its right to withdraw from the ABM Treaty for a 10-year period while observing it strictly. The USSR gives its consent to setting limits on the number of warheads for individual types of USSR and U.S. strategic offensive arms. It is moreover prepared to undertake that—within the framework of a total number of 6,000 warheads on the sides' strategic offensive arms—no more than 3,000-3,300 warheads are installed on ICBM's, no more than 1,800-2,000 warheads on submarine-based ballistic missiles, and no more than 800-900 combat charges on air-launched cruise missiles. This takes into account U.S. ideas on "sublevels" and makes it possible to advance work on the draft treaty on a 50% reduction of strategic offensive arms so that it could be signed next year during a visit to Moscow by U.S. President R. Reagan.

For the purpose of consolidating the atmosphere of trust and ruling out any discussion of how the Soviet Union is allegedly violating the ABM Treaty by building the Krasnoyarsk radar station, the USSR announced the introduction of a unilateral 1-year moratorium on all work being done there. Naturally, the Soviet side expects a similar step as regards the U.S. radar station in Scotland.

The USSR has also submitted other proposals and clarifications in development of its positions, especially the proposal to define a list of devices whose placement in space is prohibited. Almost everyone in the world realizes the fundamental importance of observance of the ABM Treaty for guaranteeing strategic stability, especially given a radical reduction in strategic offensive arms. It is not for nothing that the absolute majority of states, including U.S. allies, are in favor of retaining the ABM Treaty.

It is well-known that, in the course of their forthcoming meeting in Washington and under the accord that has been reached, the leaders of the two countries will concentrate their attention on the problems of reducing strategic offensive arms and will discuss the question of nonwithdrawal from the ABM Treaty (in other words both sides' renunciation of their right to withdraw from it during an agreed period) and its future observance. It is planned to prepare a suitable base for a future treaty on strategic offensive arms and instructions to delegations at the talks in Geneva and at other levels.

The successful conclusion of work on the medium- and shorter-range missile treaty, the experience gained during that work, and the reciprocal readiness that was displayed in seeking a solution and the necessary balance of interests—all these represent a valuable gain. There is a real opportunity to take the next and decisive step in nuclear disarmament—to reach agreement on the reduction of strategic offensive arms. For this purpose it is necessary to give a powerful political fillip to the negotiating process at the summit meeting. This is what the people expect. To put an end to the fatally dangerous rivalry in the nuclear sphere, to consolidate existing treaties, and to conclude accords on the profound reduction of the nuclear arsenals built up by both countries—this is the command of the times.

Lessons of 1959, 1973 Summits Pondered

PM271755 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Nov 87 Morning Edition p 5

[Article by N. Yefimov and S. Kondrashov: "Essential Reminders About Two Visits Ahead of the Third"]

[Text] As he looks back at the past a person discovers that he is living not only in the present, not only for a single day, no matter how packed it may be, but also in history and for history. An upcoming event—the visit to Washington by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee—provides a reason for looking back at past decades and for noting, as a start, that Soviet-U.S. summit meetings are infrequent and visits by top Soviet leaders to the capital of the other superpower are an absolute rarity.

Before the visit which begins 7 December there were only two others—N.S. Khrushchev's in September 1959 and L.I. Brezhnev's in June 1973. Under Stalin a visit across the ocean was inconceivable in view of the nature of Soviet-U.S. relations at that time. There were meetings with U.S. President Roosevelt during the war years (Tehran in 1943 and Yalta in 1945) and with President Truman in the summer of 1945 in Potsdam at the height of the triumph of the allied victory over Hitler, to which the U.S. President had already added another separate triumph of his own aimed against the Soviet ally—the secret creation of the atomic bomb, which was tested for the first time in the New Mexico desert during his visit to Potsdam but was still waiting for its first test on people, the Japanese of Hiroshima. This was the dawn of the nuclear race, which has been at the center of the entire subsequent Soviet-U.S. dialogue; but the Potsdam meeting is not the subject of our remarks, and nor, strictly speaking, are other Soviet-U.S. summit meetings outside Washington.

So, in September 1959 N.S. Khrushchev arrived in Washington for meetings with Dwight Eisenhower aboard a TU-114, an aircraft which astounded the Americans, and in June 1973 L.I. Brezhnev paid another visit to the U.S. capital when President Richard Nixon was in office. An interval of 14 years. By the kind of coincidence which history never escapes, it will have been another 14 years before the third meeting in Washington, between M.S. Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan. We hope that we will not be suspected of some kind of cabalism or of suggesting that, given intervals of this size, the fourth meeting could be taking place in the next century—in 2001. Ours is a different task. People, often unjustly, talk of the past as darkness. Yet the past can be like a lamp which throws a better light on even the clear day of the present and facilitates to some extent our understanding of the future. The past does not provide the present with ready-made formulas for the future but shows the direction and length of the path that has been traveled, the achievements and lacunae, teaches soberness in making assessments, and protects against starry-eyed illusions. It shows where we have been, what kind of people we are, and how much we have grown up.

Before offering these observations we read the two official records, published in booklet form, of the 1959 and 1973 visits; the first was thicker, with more than 400 pages, the second rather thinner, with around 250. Of course, they do not contain the entire history of those two periods, which still awaits from Soviet specialists a less dogmatic, freer, and to some extent critical interpretation, which is needed so we can understand today better—possibly in the spirit of glasnost, more openness, and the new practice of political discussions, including on foreign policy questions. But the lengthy records do capture the spirit of those times. Bear witness to how we have changed since those times in attaching paramount importance to the new political thinking with its freedom from dogma, flexible consideration of the balance of all states' interests, and priority to panhuman interests and values. Neither in 1959 nor even in 1973, when there had been an accumulation of experience and, even more so, of nuclear weapons, was there such humanization of foreign policy and such a desire to understand the other side and meet him halfway—without abandoning one's own interests, of course. Although, it must be stressed, there has always been a sincere aspiration for peace—an aspiration inherent in the very nature of socialism and augmented many times over by our people's great trials during the war years.

N.S. Khrushchev spent 13 days in the United States, visiting New York, Los Angeles, San Francisco, the State of Iowa, and Pittsburg in the State of Pennsylvania, as well as Washington. An energetic and emotional man, never at a loss for words, always ready with a popular, sometimes vulgar saying, he not only discovered America for himself, but also revealed us to the Americans. Us—and himself, attracting many by his liveliness and candor.

As one reads his U.S. speeches now, one sees running through them a confidence that in the economic, scientific, technical respects we were about to catch America at the next station, give a victorious whistle, and leave it behind. Before leaving for the United States, he said: "In the next 10-12 years we will surpass the United States both in terms of absolute industrial volume and in terms of per capita production. In agriculture the task will be resolved much sooner." As we know, this did not happen. Khrushchev underestimated the might of the U.S. economy and the dynamism and vitality of a country capable of getting results through ruthless domestic competition and various forms of exploitation of the outside world. On the other hand, there seems to have been a persisting faith that socialism would demonstrate its superiority kind of automatically, without profound economic transformations revealing the maximum potential of every citizen and working person.

As for the main aspect of the 1959 visit to the United States, the political and diplomatic aspect, no agreements were signed. What is more, there was not even a previously arranged agenda for the conversations that took place between the two leaders. Nuclear missile matters got what you might call a passing mention, although the world "madness" had already been used to describe a possible nuclear war. An accord was reached on continuing a person-to-person dialogue and on a reciprocal visit by Eisenhower to the Soviet Union. But the dialogue was interrupted (not for the last time), and the visit did not take place—on 1 May 1960 in the vicinity of Sverdlovsk an antiaircraft missile brought down a U.S. U-2 spy plane on a flight authorized by Eisenhower himself. This act of ungentlemanly conduct and the President's refusal to make an apology, which Khrushchev insisted on having, ruled out the possibility of Eisenhower visiting our country and also messed up the Paris summit meeting of the leaders of the USSR, the United States, Britain, and France and rendered it fruitless.

What else? N.S. Khrushchev persistently urged U.S. senators and businessmen to eliminate discriminations in Soviet-U.S. trade. Speaking in New York to the UN General Assembly, he expounded the Soviet plan for universal and complete disarmament. It was suggested that all states completely eliminate armed forces and armaments of all types starting with conventional forces and finishing with nuclear forces, disband ground forces, destroy navies, military aircraft, general staffs, military ministries, close military training establishments, and so on. And all this over 4 years. This was an ambitious, and to be frank, impracticable plan. This is quite obvious from the viewpoint of our experience today. In 4 years destroy all barriers of distrust, all bastions of suspicion, all fortresses of hostility—and wholly disarm, throughout the whole world, leaving only modest forces for maintaining internal order in every country?! Moreover at the height of the "cold war." We now realize that such matters cannot be carried out at such rates. Did people realize it then?

This plan was impracticable, among other things, because it did not provide for any detailed verification system. Verification and inspection were then practically tantamount to the concept of espionage and N.S. Khrushchev expressed his attitude to them graphically and bluntly. For instance, using the following words: "Don't climb into someone else's bedroom when the door to it is locked."

In his recently published book M.S. Gorbachev stresses that a long path, agonizing, and the repudiation of some postulates previously thought to be immutable have brought us to the new thinking. It seems that one of the most convincing examples of this is the changed attitude to questions of verification, monitoring, and inspection. It would have been quite impossible 30 years ago to permit even the thought of a visit by foreign specialists to Shikhany, to a chemical weapons storage facility, or to the atomic testing range near Semipalatinsk. Yet this is now possible—and not only in thought. Now, in elaborating a Soviet-U.S. agreement on medium- and shorter-range missiles, both sides have agreed to all manner of on-site inspections, including so-called inspections on suspicion, which will operate for 13 years after the agreement has come into force. In effect, as E.A. Shevardnadze said, the participants in the agreement "have renounced some of their sovereign rights in permitting inspectors on their territory." Is this not readiness to confirm in practice the concept of the 27th CPSU Congress regarding the unity and interconnection of a contradictory and highly complex world!

Unlike the first visit to Washington, the second one in June 1973 was preceded by careful preparations, both immediate and throughout the previous 14 years. The Caribbean "missile crisis" of October 1962, when, to use the expression of then U.S. President John Kennedy, the two powers spent several days playing "nuclear eyeballing" [glyadelki], had taught a great deal. It gave a nudge to the process of negotiations on nuclear arms control—a process which has continued since then. In the summer of 1963 the USSR, the United States, and Britain concluded the Moscow treaty banning nuclear tests in three environments.

But by the end of the sixties our partners' chief state energy was still being expended on seeking a way out of the quagmire of the Vietnam war. In addition, the careers of two U.S. Presidents had been cut short. Kennedy was brought down by the bullets of an assassin—or assassins?—in Dallas, and his successor, Lyndon Johnson, also a Democrat, by the internal political consequences of the Vietnam adventure, which forced him to abandon his re-election attempt in 1968. However, Nixon, the conservative Republican elected in the 1968 election, was already reaping the fruits of the U.S.-Soviet dialogue toward the end of his first term as President, using them to strengthen his positions in the November 1972 election, which also brought him victory.

The point is that L.I. Brezhnev's visit to Washington in June 1973 had been preceded by R. Nixon's visit to Moscow in May 1972. The Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Systems, the Interim Agreement on Certain Measures With Respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (SALT I), and the document "Fundamentals of Relations Between the USSR and the United States," which proceeds from the fact of their strategic parity, their right to equal security, and the need for peaceful coexistence, had been signed at that time.

Then the 8 days which L.I. Brezhnev spent in the United States—Washington, Camp David, and San Clemente in California, where President Nixon's residence was. The element of direct familiarization with America and the Americans had diminished considerably compared with 1959. There were no impromptu speeches or appearances before mass audiences—which reflected both the different temperament of the Soviet leader and the changed nature of the times: The world had become more dangerous not only because of the accumulated mountains of weapons but also thanks to widespread violence and terrorism. On the other hand, several agreements on the development of cooperation in various spheres were signed, as well as the symbolically important Agreement on the Prevention of Nuclear War and another important document—"The Basic Principles of Talks on the Further Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms." This was one of the stages on the long road to the SALT II Treaty, which, let us recall, was signed in 1979 (now by President Carter on the U.S. side) but remains unratified.

Let us go back, though, to the visit in 1973. Its tone was businesslike and optimistic. The joint final communique proclaimed a "joint determination to continue the course aimed at the accelerated improvement of Soviet-U.S. relations." At a dinner in the U.S. President's honor, L.I. Brezhnev said: "We are optimists... We want the further development of our relations to be most stable and, furthermore, irreversible in character." The watchword of that period was detente. The dominant phrase was the irreversibility of detente. It must be said frankly, however, that this phrase was only heard from the Soviet side.

It is necessary to emphasize now a fact which at that time found its way into our newspapers only with difficulty and delay. Detente had very powerful enemies—extreme rightwingers, who are always plentiful in America, the military-industrial complex, labor unions with an anti-Soviet bias, and influential Zionist organizations. The battering ram with which they methodically and, unfortunately, successfully broke down the walls of detente was the question of "freedom of emigration" from the Soviet Union.

Yes, military-strategic parity with the United States was a great achievement for the Soviet Union, especially if you consider that in 1962, at the time of the Caribbean crisis, we had 15 times fewer strategic nuclear warheads than the Americans (the estimate of the then U.S. Defense Secretary R. MacNamara). But the U.S. adherents of the policy of strength do not like an equal in the international arena. From their vantage point parity seemed not an achievement but a defeat which had to be overcome by building up their nuclear and conventional strength. Some of those people believed that parity could even be a trap for the Soviet Union by constantly raising the level of military confrontation and imposing on the other, economically inferior, country new and increasingly burdensome rounds of the arms race.

Although the 1973 Washington summit ended on a high note, it was felt even then that this was exaggerated optimism. Soviet-U.S. dialogue again ran into the most difficult and permanent obstacle—the random nature of the U.S. domestic political struggle. The main thing working against it was a totally unconnected phenomenon—the Watergate scandal. Within a year of Brezhnev's visit Nixon had already been expelled from the White House in disgrace. However, even by 1975 talk about the "Soviet threat" and the rate of buildup of Soviet military might was the dominant theme in U.S. political and military-political circles. Even initiators of detente on the U.S. side such as Henry Kissinger began most zealously condemning both the practice and the very concept of detente. The Americans' move toward conservatism, caused primarily by domestic considerations, forced President Carter to "swing to the right" and led at the end of 1980 to the election of Ronald Reagan to the White House and the era of Reaganism.

Then came the story of the last few years which everyone remembers well and which is still filling the newspapers today. We will not recount it. Let us just note that recently, in connection with the resignation of Defense Secretary Weinberger, someone worked out that military expenditure under this presidency has approximately doubled, reaching the mind-blowing sum of $2 trillion.

Meanwhile, right up to Reagan's arrival in the White House, people continued to adhere to the view that trends to preserve detente rather than to destroy it prevailed in Soviet-U.S. relations. If we take a closer and more critical look at the recent past, detente was for us not only a vitally important objective but also a kind of tranquilizer which we used deliberately or otherwise, a means to induce a feeling of well-being in society in which the phenomena of stagnation were building up. If you like, detente was an attempt to improve matters in the foreign policy sphere. It would have been better, however, to start from the other side. History, the people, and the fate of socialism demanded a restructuring inside the country. It is necessary to begin with oneself, and only by restructuring oneself, by having changed for the better, can a person, and likewise a state, command respect and trust and begin to successfully restructure his or its relations with other people and other states. The path of self-improvement is the best path toward other people and other states.

We are at the beginning of this path. Our reputation—as public opinion polls in the West show—is already changing for the better. In the selfsame United States more and more people are changing the views which they held in recent years, they are convincing themselves that we want to disarm rather than arm ourselves. The Soviet leader is going to Washington in order to seal in the form of a treaty with the U.S. President the first achievements in the cause of real nuclear disarmament, in order to ensure that after the first contacts and experiences of Geneva and Reykjavik our joint steps become bigger and more confident.

The past which we have briefly described shows what a difficult matter this is. Difficult, and now as before, not easily predictable. Primarily because of the nature of the life on the U.S. domestic scene, because of its haphazardness. This is making itself felt also now, on the eve of M.S. Gorbachev's visit and it does not always inspire confidence. It will be felt even more strongly in the coming year, the stormy year of presidential elections. But what can you do? There is no other option than either to try and survive together by establishing relations or to perish together as a result of hostility in the grim and terrible nuclear age.

The Soviet leadership has been stating with greater persistence and conviction than ever before that the Soviet Union will continue to seek cooperation and fruitful talks with any president elected by the U.S. people. We are looking at ourselves and the surrounding world more realistically than ever before. However, in Washington, too, people must become more aware of this unprecedented realism and unprecedented readiness on our part and they must with the same sense of statemanlike responsibility make use of the prevailing favorable situation in the interests of the American people, the Soviet people, and the whole world. "No previous administration in recent decades has had a better chance to do something toward improving relations with the USSR."

These are the words of the man who in a few days' time will be the guest of the U.S. President.

Kuznetsov Views Ties Prior to Summit

LD271819 Moscow in English to North America 0000 GMT 27 Nov 87

[From the "Tonight" program: Pavel Kuznetsov commentary]

[Text] According to reports from Washington, conservative lawmakers are against the idea of inviting Soviet leader Mihail Gorbachev to address a joint meeting of Congress during his summit meeting with President Reagan. Pavel Kuznetsov of our staff has the following remarks:

Arranging a state visit is a demanding job, writes Pavel Kuznetsov, especially if you consider the amount of invitations from varous groups and individuals who want to meet with Mikhail Gorbachev or simply have him as a guest of honor in their homes. Americans are well known for their hospitality. According to Gennadiy Gerasimov, a Foreign Ministry spokesman, inviting Mikhail Gorbachev to address the U.S. Congress was broached by the American side and after the preliminary sounding of the mood in Congress the idea was relayed to Soviet planners. However, there seems to be strong opposition from conservative law makers. A White House aide was quoted as saying in this respect that people are not invited to one's home to be insulted.

Nobody, not even the leader of a great nation can come gate-crashing on Congress. Likewise, nobody has the moral right to be rude, abrasive and impolite to those in the Soviet Union who have taken a political decision to pull out from Afghanistan, and who seek to transform Soviet society along far more democratic guidelines, not only by denouncing the economic and intellectual stagnation and the lawlessness of the past, but also by encouranging sweeping reforms, including those in the legal system.

When so-called refuseniks could not leave this country we were described as brutes. Now that they have been able to emigrate we are being described as blow-dried commies engaged in trading in valuable Jewish lives for favors. When the wind of glasnost and perestroyka began to blow in this country we heard patronizing comments to the effect that, thank God, they are now more like us. But when it became obvious that the thrust of the new wind of change was aimed at transforming socialism into a better and more competitive system to benefit our people, and that the effort was not a parrot imitation of a typical Western society, this was followed by [words indistinct] derision and a heap of insults thrown in our face. Pathological hatred got the better of the initial urge to talk, listen, reason and argue.

This should not be taken as a blanket accusation. Of course, there are many people in Congress who would like to hear the Soviet leader out, and such meetings, as well as those with people from the business community, are going to take place. Fortunately for America, the land is still rich in human beings, sober-minded and goodhumored, who seem to be sick and tired of smug pretences that are so lavishly displayed by some law makers. U.S.-Soviet relations have never been friction-free. Nor are they likely to become a bed of roses in the years to come. But there are historic moments when the bad things could be put behind us, not as demonstration of pretended brotherhood but at least as a world-wide message that we are eager to continue to explore the vital and delicate area of arms control and disarmament, like the one we are having now, when in Washington the two leaders will sign an INF treaty, scrapping for the first time in history two classes of nuclear arms.

Karpov Cited on Arms Talks at Summit

LD272309 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2205 GMT 27 Nov 87

[Text] Moscow, 28 Nov (TASS)—A TASS diplomatic correspondent reports:

Now that the treaty on medium and shorter-range missiles, which envisages the total elimination of these two classes of Soviet and U.S. arms, is effectively ready for signing, on what the Soviet Union and the United States will be able to reach agreement as regards strategic arms is acquiring increasing significance, Viktor Karpov, head of the USSR Foreign Ministry Problems of Arms Control and Disarmament Administration, said in an interview to a TASS diplomatic correspondent.

Back in November 1985 in Geneva the USSR and U.S. top leaders agreed on the desirability of implementing 50% reductions in their strategic offensive weapons. At the summit conference in Washington at the beginning of December this subject must be given a thorough examination. What, it would seem, should be done on this level? First of all—determine the main starting positions which would guide the USSR and U.S. delegations during the negotiations in Geneva as they elaborate a draft treaty.

Some initial principles, Viktor Karpov said, have already been agreed—they were talked about at Reykjavik. It was agreed, in particular, that the strategic offensive arms of the sides are to be reduced to equal levels in respect to the numbers of nuclear weapon carriers and the number of nuclear warheads on them. Correspondingly, at the end of the period of reductions the USSR and the United States could have no more than 1,600 means of delivery and no more than 6,000 nuclear warheads in their strategic forces.

There is also agreement in principle regarding the necessity to find ways of limiting long-range sea-based nuclear cruise missiles. There are other clauses, too, which have already been agreed. The more of these initial propositions agreed upon in Washington, the more easily and quickly the delegations will be able to finish working out the text of the treaty.

This is highly important, taking into account the fact that there is understanding between the United States and the USSR regarding the fact that the treaty on 50% reductions in strategic offensive arms could be signed during President Ronald Reagan's reply visit to the Soviet Union in 1988. One can think, the Soviet expert emphasized, that bearing in mind the situation in the United States itself such a visit would more than likely take place not later than mid-1988, which imposes quite clear and tight limits for the delegations' work.

U.S. 'Struggle' Over Dialogue Noted

LD282110 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 28 Nov 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast; Valentin Zorin report from Washington]

[Excerpts] Our special correspondent Valentin Zorin reports from Washington: [video shows distant shot of Capitol Building]

In the U.S. capital dull days have replaced the recent clear weather. Fans of various kinds of political analogies are seeking to make use of these purely external circumstances, each in their own way. But today, the main thing in the life of Washington remains the expectation of a great event—the meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and President Reagan.

Many whom it is customary to call "man in the street"—in the coming days we will have occasion to speak with tens of them, and far from every one of our conversation partners is exactly an expert in politics—unanimously welcome the arrival of the Soviet leader to the U.S. capital, and speak of the great hopes linked with this. [passage omitted]

It would be incorrect to say that everyone here is a fan of Soviet-U.S. cooperation, that they advocate the signing of important agreements between our countries, or that the political firmament is quite so cloudless above the U.S. capital. Take, for example, the U.S. Congress, outside of which I am standing. These days a bitter struggle is being waged between those in favor of Soviet-U.S. dialogue and the signing of agreements between our countries, and those who oppose this by all means. Such a struggle is exerting and, evidently will exert not a little influence on the political atmosphere in the country's capital. Unfortunately, nothing happens in this world by waving a magic wand, including the beating of swords into plowshares.

U.S. reaction has no intention of yielding its positions without a struggle. All the more important is the mission which the Soviet Union has taken upon itself; all the greater significance the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit acquires.

Gorbachev Interview With NBC, Relay Reported

LD281924 Moscow World Service in English 1900 GMT 28 Nov 87

[Text] The Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev has granted an interview to the American NBC television network. The host of the program Tom Brokaw, has told the Moscow *Associated Press* correspondent the interview will be televised next Monday at 2000 Eastern Standard Time, or 0100 Greenwich Mean Time.

The American newsman said he was convinced TV viewers in his country would be favorably impressed with the knowledge, intellect and eloquence of the Soviet leader. Mikhail Gorbachev, he said, boasts a modern style and a fresh idea of how the Soviet Union must be taken by the rest of the world.

He said the 1-hour interview was informal and touched upon Mikhail Gorbachev's forthcoming visit to the United States, arms control, human rights, restructuring and openness in the USSR. Tom Brokaw pointed out the interview with the NBC would be the first of its kind American television has received from the Soviet leader.

The interview will be broadcast on Soviet national television on the first of next month, at 2100 Moscow time, or 1800 Greenwich Mean Time.

United States & Canada

Reagan Interviewed by BBC on Upcoming Summit

LD292255 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1810 GMT 29 Nov 87

[Text] London, 29 Nov (TASS)—TASS correspondents Andrey Biryukov and Sergey Kuznetsov report:

The U.S. President Ronald Reagan has given an interview to the British television company BBC in which, in particular, he expressed the hope that the upcoming visit to Washington by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, would lead to a breakthrough in Soviet-U.S. relations. "I have always believed that if we have to begin with anything it should be the elimination of nuclear weapons," the President said. He admitted that in the event of the beginning of a nuclear war both sides would be destroyed. "It is impossible to win a nuclear war, nuclear war should never happen," R. Reagan said.

He pointed out that the impending signing of the agreement on medium and shorter range missiles "will lead to the destruction of a whole system of armaments." The head of the U.S. Administration expressed the desire "to find ways toward a 50% reduction in intercontinental ballistic missiles" jointly with the USSR, having stressed that "he wants to achieve this."

At the same time the President stated that he realized that "relations of rivalry" and "hostility" existed between the two countries. He affirmed his attachment to politics "from a position of strength," having stressed that he has "always been a supporter of the build-up in the military power of the United States."

Reagan called the U.S. armed attacks on Libya and Grenada "an achievement," which, in his words, became possible thanks precisely to his administration. Answering a question from a correspondent of the television company about whether the Libyan leader Al-Qadhdhafi was the "target" of the raid on Tripoli carried out by the U.S. Air Force, the U.S. President said: "No, but we would not have regretted it if he had been exposed to attack." Alongside this the President claimed that the United States "did everything possible to reduce to a minimum" the losses among the civilian population."

The President tried his utmost to justify the actions of the administration that he heads in connection with the "Irangate scandal" and reduce its significance. "This is the work of individuals that I do not know," he said.

'Anti-Soviet Campaign' in U.S Media Reported

LD252237 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 25 Nov 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video report from Washington by television correspondent Vladimir Dunayev]

[Text] Our correspondent Vladimir Dunayev reports from Washington: [Video shows Dunayev in front of *The Washington Times* building]

[Dunayev] It is strange, but, you know, comrades, the closer one gets to the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting here in Washington, the more fiercely the anti-Soviet campaign is being waged in the U.S. press and on television.

For example, let me tell you how the United States received the news from Geneva that the terms had finally been agreed for a treaty on eliminating two classes of missiles. The military literally at once arranged some fireworks. In the State of Utah a missile was blown up. Then Weinberger, the former secretary of defense, who is continuing to perform more energetically than when he was at the Pentagon, said on television that the Soviets cannot be trusted and that the treaty should not be concluded or ratified.

President Reagan told journalists that he is pleased that an accord has been achieved in Geneva and then immediately visited a military plant belonging to the firm of Martin Marietta, which work is done on Star Wars. He toured the plant and then stated—and this was also shown on television—that he is insisting on a continuation of the militarization of space and that he is very pleased at the way this plant and others were, so to speak, making their contribution to the Strategic Defense Initiative.

Behind me here at this spot is a building where the capital's newspaper *The Washington Times* is published. It is an extremely rightwing and extremely influential newspaper. Here is the latest edition of the newspaper: Armed U.S. naval bombers have been simulating their 27th raid on a Soviet base in Kamchatka. That is the substance of this report. Here too on the front page there is an attempt to persuade Americans that the Soviet Union is allegedly creating a red shield overhead in space as it were and that in this program the Soviet Union is considerably outstripping the United States. That is to say, the idea is that one must in no event enter into any agreements with the Soviet Union. Indeed, the whole newspaper consists, as it were, of this.

I simply want to tell you about this and let you know that a struggle is under way here and that everything is not so simple. The struggle is under way both in the press and in Congress, and it is under way on the streets too. Demonstrations have been planned in support of disarmament and in support of the visit and the negotiations. At the same time, mass demonstrations have also been planned to undermine the accords. They are directed at hampering the cause of peace and disarmament. Obviously the cold war is very beneficial to certain people here and they are extremely unwilling to part with it.

Congress, Right-Wing Criticisms Noted

LD281130 Moscow TASS in English 0907 GMT 28 Nov 87

[Text] Washington November 28 TASS—The achievement between the USSR and USA of the first major agreement in the field of real disarmament: The intermediate nuclear forces treaty due to be signed during the forthcoming summit meeting, served as a pretext for an intensification of the propaganda campaign in the USA, marked by blatant anti-Sovietism and the involvement in it of representatives of the American Congress and various right-wing organisations.

One of the main targets for their attacks is the INF treaty. In official statements on this issue the administration adheres to the position that has been agreed by the USSR and USA. However, the fact that reports appear in the mass media quoting anonymous high-ranking officials of the White House and Department of State as saying that the treaty is unfavourable for the USA and its allies gives rise to concern.

Only a small group of right-wing legislators is openly opposed to the treaty at the Congress. As for the majority, they do not make public statements alleging that the final text has not been prepared and that the provisions of the agreement pertaining to verification are yet unknown, etc. Conditions are also being advanced that are tied to the signing of the INF treaty. One of them is the demand that the Warsaw Treaty reduce conventional weapons and destroy chemical weapons.

The recent statement by William Burns, deputy assistant secretary for politico-military affairs, who laid out the position of the State Department in a meeting with journalists, can not be called responsible. He said that the USA supported the idea of reducing conventional weapons in Europe as well. However, Burns maintains, in connection with the alleged superiority of the Warsaw Treaty countries in this respect, it is necessary to reduce their armaments while NATO must continue modernising its forces.

Conjectures about the Warsaw Treaty superiority in conventional and chemical weapons are being inflated by right-wing organisations, which are not concerned with the correspondence of the data they cite with reality. The public opinion cannot but be influenced in one way or another by letters and statements, appearing in Washington newspapers, which are directed against the INF treaty or simply urge to "fight the reds".

The activity of several committees and groups, set up in the USA in November with the aim of thwarting the summit meeting and the signing of the INF treaty, is blatantly anti-Soviet. For example, the committee stop the treaty, which groups U.S. and FRG retired generals and officers, has become most active. In their opinion, the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles will leave terrorists free to act (participants in the movement for arms reduction are meant—TASS) and cause the collapse of the political system of the "free world". Such provocative statements have become numerous in Washington of late.

It is noteworthy that "human rights violations" in the USSR are assigned a place in the provocative anti-Soviet campaign. A number of Jewish organisations reported their decision to hold mass demonstrations and other acts of protest in Washington ahead of and during Mikhail Gorbachev's visit. As before, the so-called "Baltic Map" gives Western politicians no peace. Plans have become known to draw attention to the alleged human rights violations in Soviet Central Asia and the Ukraine. Congressmen Paul B. Henry (Republican, Michigan), Tom Lantos, (Democrat, California) and John E. Porter (Republican, Illinois) stated bluntly that the human rights issue must be linked to any problem, including arms control, discussed between the USA and USSR.

All this testifies to the beginning of a coordinated campaign in the USA aiming to hamper progress in Soviet-U.S. relations. This is an irresponsible position, which is bound to damage the cause of peace and mankind's security.

Gen Razuvanov on U.S. CW Information

LD251730 Moscow TASS in English 1646 GMT 25 Nov 87

[Text] Moscow November 25 TASS—TASS diplomatic correspondent writes:

Western journalists raise as a trump-card the issue of the chemical weapons stocks in the USSR at any press conference on problems involved in this type of weaponry. This is done to repeat once again to their readers that the Soviet Union refuses to name figures whereas the United States did it.

The United States has really announced the size of its chemical weapons stocks and their storage sites, but these figures do not give a complete picture even to specialists, whereas the Soviet proposals lying on the negotiating table in Geneva provide for an exchange of complete information about the stocks and depots even prior to the adoption of a convention on banning chemical weapons.

"The U.S. figures do not have an absolute number of chemical weapons. The named facilities and the per cent of the stocks in storage at them from the overall number in existence does not create a full picture", argues General Robert Razuvanov, head of the Soviet chemical complex in Shikhany, who returned this week from the display of U.S. chemical weapons in Tooele, Utah. "The United States did not name either its depots in Western Europe and this, from the military point of view, is the most sensitive information".

Robert Razuvanov recalled that at the talks in Geneva the USSR suggests exchanging complete figures for the sake of the earliest signing of a convention banning chemical weaponry. In this connection, it is not clear who does not want in actual fact to announce the size of its stocks: the United States or the USSR? The more so that the inspection on 48-hour notice of any site or facility on challenge, proposed by the Soviet side now, opens up the possibility of reliable verification of the observance of the convention.

Colonel-General Vladimir Pikalov, head of the chemical troops of the USSR Defence Ministry, stated on more than one occasion that there is parity between in [as received] the USSR and the United States in the field of chemical weapons, since none of the states will have stocks of toxic agents which cannot be put to use.

Nonetheless, in the West they like to repeat that the USSR has a ten-fold edge over the United States in the size of its chemical arsenals. What is left is only to guess where will the USSR hide in 48 hours, given such a total control, its ten-fold superiority in the event of the signing of the convention?

The U.S. side, however, is in no hurry to clarify it. The reason behind this is in its unwillingness to abandon its binary programme, which, according to Soviet diplomats' estimate, can undermine the signing of the convention. For binaries only become lethal when several harmless chemical compounds are brought together, which steeply complicates the problem of verifying the non-production of chemical weapons.

The U.S. side in Tooele has demonstrated to the Soviet delegation a new 155-millimeter binary chemical projectile, GB-2, apparently showing the irreversibility of the process to put this type of weapon into production. And this is actually a real difficulty on the way to the convention on chemical weapons rather than the problems of verification, size and storage made up by the West.

U.S. Tests Air-Launched Cruise Missile

LD261301 Moscow TASS in English 1259 GMT 26 Nov 87

[Text] Washington November 26 TASS—The United States has carried out the first test of an air-launched cruise missile from a new B-1 strategic bomber. The Pentagon is planning to arm 100 B-1 bombers (which will take the place of B-52 ones) with cruise missiles.

An official spokesman for the Pentagon said on Wednesday that the test had been successful. The B-1 bomber had launched the cruise missile during a low-altitude flight over a firing range in Utah. The Pentagon declined to give any technical details of the test which had been conducted on November 24.

Titan Rocket Launched To Deploy Satellite

LD290908 Moscow TASS in English 0856 GMT 29 Nov 87

[Text] New York November 29 TASS—TASS correspondent Andrey Chytov reports:

The United States Saturday launched a Titan-34 D booster rocket from Cape Canaveral Space Port in Florida Saturday and the *Associated Press* said the aim was to deploy a military satellite for monitoring Soviet missile launches.

If the mission is fulfilled, the flight will be the second successful Titan launch since October 26. Before that the booster was grounded for 18 months after a series of accidents.

By orbiting a second spy satellite in a row, the Pentagon is in a hurry to make up for the time lost due to the absence of boosters capable of taking such payloads to near-earth space. Flights by reusable space shuttles, which were used for the purpose along with Titans, have been suspended as well following last year's *Challenger* disaster.

Gerasimov Cited on Background to Shapiro Case

LD271850 Moscow TASS in English 1823 GMT 27 Nov 87

[Text] Moscow November 27 TASS—A TASS diplomatic correspondent reports:

The *Associated Press* has distributed a statement by Mrs Linda Shapiro, widow of the American citizen Lee Shapiro who is presented in the report as a film documentalist, "deliberately killed by Soviet troops" in Afghanistan. An anti-Soviet campaign is being kindled around the widow's statement by the U.S. mass media.

Lee Shapiro is an American who, judging by the report of the news agency, made his way to Afghanistan on an anti-governmental armed unit, but not through requesting accreditation and visa from the authorities of the country, as journalists usually do. In the report there is no mention either of the press organ, a television company or a cinema firm that he represented. It is only said that Lee Shapiro was allegedly making a film in Afghanistan for five months.

The TASS diplomatic correspondent approached head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry Gennadiy Gerasimov for explanation of the Lee Shapiro case. "We have no other information about this case, only from American sources", said the representative of the Foreign Ministry of the USSR. One, certainly, regrets the deaths of people wherever it happens, including in Afghanistan—Afghanis, Soviets, Americans. One understands the feelings of Mrs Linda Shapiro".

"But the question arises: Why is one witnessing exactly now, ahead of Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to the United States, more frequent attempts in the United States to influence the sentiments of Americans, to make them believe that the Soviet people are brutal and ill-intentioned?" said Gennadiy Gerasimov. "Very much similar campaigns with almost identical slogans were held, for instance, in Paris ahead of Mikhail Gorbachev's visit there in October 1985!"

"Deaths of people in Afghanistan can be prevented only by stopping weapons being sent there, and stopping other interference from outside, by promoting national reconciliation in the country, but not by hampering it", underlined the representative of the Foreign Ministry of the USSR.

Comparison of Reagan, Opposition Remarks

Moscow *Pravda* in Russian on 27 November 1987 in its second edition on page 5 carries a V. Gan dispatch under the headline "Confrontation." A comparison with the version of the same item carried in the first edition of the 27 November Moscow *Pravda* on page 5 under the same headline and published on page 18 of the 27 November Soviet Union *Daily Report* reveals the following variations: Page 18: Column two, paragraph five, sentence five reads: ...of world domination."

A very unusual...[picking up paragraph six, omitting last three sentences of paragraph five] Page 19: Column one, paragraph one, last sentence reads: ...what will follow."

A case in... [omitting paragraph two, first sentence of paragraph three, picking up with second sentence of paragraph three] Column one, paragraph three, sentence four reads: ...quite in order.

But no way!... [Picking up paragraph four, first sentence, omitting part of last sentence of paragraph three, changing punctuation].

China

Gorbachev Discusses Soviet-Chinese Relations
OW290037 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1500 GMT 28 Nov 87

[Text] Soviet leader Gorbachev said the Soviet people entertain friendly feelings toward the Chinese people, toward great China. In his meeting in Moscow with President Kaunda of Zambia, he said that the Soviet-Chinese relations are developing in various fields. Their further improvement and development will indisputably serve toward improving the whole system of international relations, and make it possible to resolve successfully many questions pertaining to the development of cooperation between the nations of the Asia-Pacific region.

Gorbachev said the Soviet leadership drew attention to the statement by Deng Xiaoping in the conversation with Takako Doi, chairman of the Central Executive Committee of the Socialist Party of Japan, about his readiness to meet with the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Gorbachev stressed: We have said more than once that such a meeting also accords with our wish, that it could be held in Moscow, Beijing, or any other convenient place. But the Chinese side is known to stipulate that such a meeting could be held only after some preliminary obtacles have been eliminated, referring first and foremost to a Cambodian settlement. The general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee pointed out: Meetings between statesmen are held precisely to discuss and solve complex issues of bilateral and international relations. For example, there are by far more disputable problems between the Soviet Union and the United States, yet this does not prevent Soviet-American summit contacts. This does not prevent Chinese-American talks either.

The Soviet leader wished the Chinese people every success in their endeavor, in building socialism.

NOVOSTI Pamphlet on Relations With PRC
OW280437 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 24 Nov 87

[Text] *Novosti* has published a pamphlet in Moscow entitled Answers to 100 Questions about the Soviet Union. Among other things, it answers questions about the development of Soviet-Chinese relations.

The pamphlet says: The Soviet position is that China is a large nation and a nation advancing along the socialist path. Therefore, the Soviet Union and China naturally share identical views on a series of modern fundamental questions. The two countries have declared never to be the first to use nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union resolutely opposes the Star Wars program of the United States. China's stand on this question is similar to that of the Soviet Union. Soviet and Chinese leaders believe that peace is needed to facilitate social renewal in their own countries.

The pamphlet, Answers to 100 Questions about the Soviet Union, says that the Soviet Union wishes very much to improve relations with China, and holds that China's prospects are good if it wishes to do the same.

World Events Depend on USSR-PRC Relations
OW290215 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 21 Nov 87

[Ivanov commentary]

[Excerpts] Listeners, it will soon be the first anniversary of the signing of the Delhi Declaration calling for a nuclear-free and nonviolent world. The declaration was signed by CPSU Central Committee General Secretary Gorbachev and Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi on 27 November 1986 in New Delhi. The document points out that [words indistinct] and mutual understanding and trust should exist in international relations. Station observer Ivanov comments on the event:

The establishment and development of Soviet-Indian friendly relations exemplify mutual understanding and trust. It shows that two big countries, despite different social systems, can cooperate in all fields and strive together for a nuclear-free and nonviolent world. The Soviet Union has repeatedly stated that it is willing to cooperate with any country on the principle of equality and mutual benefit. [passage omitted]

Our country takes into consideration the interests and aspirations of Asian countries. We have stated that we are willing to destroy our medium- and shorter-range missiles deployed in Europe and Asia. This statement helps enhance mutual trust.

Of course, the relations between socialist countries, particularly Soviet-Chinese relations, should have an important impact on this region.

In his speech in Vladivostok, Comrade Gorbachev emphasized: History has entrusted the Soviet and Chinese peoples with an exceptionally important mission. A great deal in international development depends on the two largest socialist countries. In recent years, there has been a noticeable improvement in Soviet-Chinese relations. Such a situation fills the people in this region and the entire world with optimistic hope.

Bilateral Water Use Accord Signed

LD281748 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1701 GMT 28 Nov 87

[Text] Moscow, 28 November (TASS)—The second sitting of the Soviet-Chinese commission on using water resources of the border sections of the Amur and Argun Rivers ended in Moscow today. The session's participants decided to complete the development of a scheme for the integrated use of the two rivers' border sections' water by the year 1992.

As Polad Polad-Zade, USSR first deputy minister of land reclamation and water resources and head of the Soviet delegation, told a TASS correspondent, as the scheme is prepared, the interests of the many economic branches in both countries will be taken into consideration. Among these are irrigation, shipping, and fisheries. "We believe the chief tasks to be development of hydroelectricity, combating flooding, and improving water supplies," said the Soviet representative.

An agreement was signed today on scientific and technological cooperation between the USSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources and the PRC Ministry of Water Conservancy and Electric Power.

Ties With PRC, India Considered Good

OW281102 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1500 GMT 27 Nov 87

[Kudrin commentary]

[Excerpts] Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, has ended his formal friendly visit to India. The following is an article by Kudrin, station observer, on this visit.

The schedule of this visit includes attending the solemn opening ceremony of the Soviet Festival held in India, signing of agreements on economic and technical cooperation, and talks on international issues. This visit once again proves that the Soviet-Indian relationship is positively constructive. They do not oppose any third country or pose a threat to anyone. On the contrary, every phase of the development of this relationship is designed to improve stability in Asia. The Soviet-Indian relationship is a splendid example, proving that the peoples of Asia, if they can be closely united and can coordinate their respective efforts, will make great contributions to universal peace and that in Asia. [passage omitted]

While strengthening its ties with India, the Soviet Union believes that promoting contacts with China, another big country in Asia, will also serve the cause of universal peace. The Soviet Union and China are getting closer in sharing a common viewpoint on a number of international issues—a fact which will become a basis for effective cooperation for a clearly defined objective. The Soviets highly evaluate the Delhi Declaration, regarding it as an experience of a new document in a new era. However, they have not forgotten that it did not emerge from nowhere. Its origin can be traced in the principle of peaceful coexistence jointly formulated by India and China back in the fifties. The tradition of common struggle by the peoples of Asia in those years also applies today, and should be carried forward.

Li Peng Cited on Intentions as Premier

PM271431 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Nov 87 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent Yu. Savenkov dispatch: "At the Chinese National People's Congress Standing Committee"]

[Text] Beijing—The routine session of the Chinese National People's Congress [NPC] Standing Committee that ended Tuesday in the Chinese capital approved Zhao Ziyang's request to be relieved of his duties as premier of the PRC State Council in connection with his election as general secretary of the CPC Central Committee.

This decision will be presented for ratification by the first session of the NPC, seventh convocation, to be held next spring. The NPC Standing Committee has appointed Li Peng, member of the CPC Central Committee Politburo Standing Committee and formerly vice premier of the PRC State Council, as acting premier of the State Council. He will head the State Council's work until the NPC's spring session

Li Peng stated that he will firmly implement the main line of the 13th CPC Congress, the policy of stability and unity within the country, and an independent foreign policy, and will actively promote China's socialist modernization. He stressed the need to conduct preparatory work to reform state organs.

The NPC Standing Committee also approved the law on rural inhabitants' committees, which will come into force on an experimental basis 1 June 1988.

U.S. 'Campaign' on Tibet Question Condemned

LD281913 Moscow TASS in English 1805 GMT 28 Nov 87

[Text] Beijing November 28 TASS—"China strongly condemns the provocative campaign launched by a number of members of the U.S. Congress over the so-called Tibetan question. The campaign is a gross interference in the internal affairs of the People's Republic of China (PRC)", says a statement by the Commission for Nationalities' Affairs of the National People's Congress. The statement was circulated by the *Xinhua* news agency today.

"Some U.S. congressmen went to such lengths", the statement points out, "that they directly participated in organizing a demonstration outside the Embassy of the PRC in Washington and even demanded the 'independence of Tibet'. Such actions are an affront to the national feelings and dignity of the Chinese people and are aimed at undermining China's national unity. They also darken relations between the PRC and the United States".

The statement urges the U.S. congressmen to cease interfering in the internal affiars of the PRC, to respect the norms of inter-state relations, and to give up any actions detrimental to Sino-American relations.

PRC Continues Process of Economic Reforms

OW281156 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1145 GMT 24 Nov 87

[Valeriy Korzin commentary; from the "World Today" program]

[Text] The process of economic reform continues in China. Many unresolved problems remain. Among these is the shortage of qualified cadres.

The 13th CPC Congress, which ended recently, has set the goals for the deepening of economic reforms and strengthening the cadre composition of economic units.

How is this to be done? It is thought that there is a significant reserve of experienced specialists to be found in a large number of government departments, which are grossly over-staffed. It is proposed that out of these departments and other various ministries and sections more than half a million cadres will, by the end of next year, be transferred to legal, taxation, industrial, and trade organizations, as well as to banks, and insurance companies. Such a decision was jointly made by the CPC Central Committee and the PRC State Council.

If, as a result of this, in some local establishment a vacancy should arise or, if the staff levels have not been reached, then it is recommended that in the first place, graduates of higher institutes of learning, that is, young specialists, should be hired. I think that, by such means, not only will economic enterprises be ensured with cadres but, to some extend, the struggle against bureaucrats and functionaries, who have become entrenched in many government departments of the country is continuing.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Australia's Hawke Visits Soviet Union

Hawke Interviewed

OW290151 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0025 GMT 28 Nov 87

[Interview with Australian Prime Minister Robert Hawke by Vitaliy Ilyashenko in Canberra; in English, fading into superimposed Russian translation; date not given—live or recorded]

[Text] [Ilyashenko] Your country is preparing to celebrate its bicentenial in January. Obviously, every country has its own problems. I would like to ask you what problems is Australia presently facing and what do you intend to do to overcome them?

[Hawke] Before I answer, let me just say that when we first decided to celebrate the 200 anniversary of European settlement of Australia, we understood full well that the Aborigines lived here for some 40,000 years before our arrival. I wish to emphasize that we have to respect the history and the culture of the aboriginals. We recognize the obligations that we have to our aboriginal fellow citizens.

Now, as to the problems which face Australia. If speaking about the economic situation, then it really is quite clear what the problem is. The problem is that by exploiting the natural resources of our country we became the most effective agricultural producers in the world. For many years the net productivity growth was achieved at the expense of the rural sector. In many aspects, this remains so to the present day.

In the last decade we began exploiting the riches of our mineral resources. If one is to bring these two things together then it becomes clear why 80% of our exports is either agricultural products or raw material. At the same time, the demand for these goods on the world market changed sharply. This has been detrimental to us. These changes have been taking place for some time but in the past year or two this resulted in a decrease in the volume of trade which translated into a drop of 9 billion dollars in our national income. Therefore Australia faces the task of restructuring [perestroyt] the economy.

[Ilyashenko interrupts] Apparently you have seen these words used in the newspapers — the restructuring of the economy.

[Hawke] Yes, I am aware that you in the USSR are engaged in this. I have been making use of this word for quite some time. We are now expanding the manufacturing and service sectors so as to reduce the imbalance of the mining industry. This is the main problem, but there are many relatively less important issues which must be solved. For example, the question of education. We have a well-trained workforce and a good system of education, but it must be made so that it produces adaptable people, able to adjust to the new conditions, who could participate in the restructuring process. This does not only apply to the school system. We also need schools to prepare and retrain those people who have lost their jobs and have become redundant. We want to engage them in new areas of economic activity. This then is the central problem facing the country.

[Ilyashenko] Thank you. Every real politician has his dream. What is your dream? How do you see the future of your country?

[Hawke] I hope that Australia has the intelligence and capacity to restructure its economy, that we will be able to examine every aspect of what is happening and ask ourselves: Is this now the best possible way to organize production? This will require a lot of discipline on the part of the management and labor organizations. In terms of the government sector we will have to examine whether the present level of development and the structure of public ownership is appropriate. Could things be done better? Are some things better done in the private sector than the public sector? These are not ideological questions as I see them, but a matter of the most effective way to satisfy the needs of the country and the needs of all Australians. So, my vision, or hope if you like, is to see Australia sufficiently mature to face these questions. The challenges are quite clear, but the first questions and the first problems are as follows: will we be sufficiently wise to make the needed changes which would allow us to affect the restructuring?

I think, looking back at my years in government, that there is a lot of evidence that Australia is becoming more mature and is increasingly more aware that it is a country of 16 million people in a world of 5 billion. We cannot determine the world we live in but we can adapt ourselves to a world that is changing faster than at any time in the history of mankind. We would be deluding ourselves if we rest solely on our past laurels. We would be overwhelmed by the economic changes that are taking place in the world if we don't adapt.

[Ilyashenko] During the 11 days of our stay in Australia, we felt the antinuclear attitude of the Australian people. Taking this into consideration, what, in your opinion, could Australia's role be in the preservation of peace in general and particularly in this region?

[Hawke] There are two stages: the world that we are forced to live in and the world that we would like to live in. The world in which we live is not a world that permits us a position that we like. We recognize that competition exists between the two superpowers—the Soviet Union and the United States. We, as many Western countries do, have close relations with the United States. From our point of view, this union is not of an aggressive nature. We have no aggressive intentions against the Soviet Union or any other country. But in a world which, since 1945, is a nuclear world, there exists a threat of a nuclear war. Up till now the world has avoided a nuclear catastrophe thanks to a system which we, in the words of Western political figures, call mutually assured destruction. The Soviet Union and the United States have accumulated sufficient capacity to destroy each other should there be a strike by either party. Humanity cannot pat itself on the back for deriving such a security system. The only possible justification for its existence is that it has worked. We have also taken part in this system. We do have facilities here that have been built jointly with the United States. They have no aggressive purposes. They exist for the verification of existing treaties—these are the early warning systems. So, in the world as it is, we are prepared to fulfill our obligations. At the same time I think I can say that our government has done much to achieve a new world in which there would be no need for such nuclear arsenals or for such joint military facilities.

We would like to see a world in which a gradual reduction of nuclear arsenals is taking place until finally, they are completely eliminated. We have played an active role in this and we pay tribute to the fact that we can speak with the Soviet Union in the same way as we can speak to the United States, and we are proud that we are continuing to do so. We welcome the nuclear disarmament progress made between Mr Gorbachev and President Reagan and we are very happy that the signing of the first agreement between the two superpowers on a real reduction of nuclear arms is about to take place shortly. We are anxiously awaiting this and we hope that this would accelerate the process of discussion on strategic arms, chemical weapons, and a universal test ban treaty. This is our position.

[Ilyashenko] We are aware, as is the rest of the world, that it was you who initiated enlivening the relations between our countries when your government came to power. Are you satisfied by the present state of these relations?

[Hawke] I think that you will understand me when I say that relations between countries are never perfect. There is always something that could be improved. But we are happy that under our government we have abandoned the sterility that characterized the activities of our predecessors in this direction. We have different ideologies, different philosophies, but this does not mean that we cannot have friendly relations. From my point of view, if we are to admit that we should be striving for a better world—a sort of world about which I spoke before—in which the endeavors of mankind could be directed at more constructive rather than destructive goals, then the Soviet Union is an essentially important player. We have to have more effective, better and constructive relations with the USSR. Therefore, I am looking forward to my visit to the Soviet Union, to the meeting with Mr Gorbachev and other leaders so as to discuss measures that we can adopt to enhance our relations in economic, scientific and cultural areas. For if we can achieve this, our relations will undoubtedly improve.

[Ilyashenko] We would like to have the opportunity to present you to our audience not only as a politician, a former trade union leader, but also as a person. Therefore I would like to ask you, what is your hobby?

[Hawke] Hobby? Well,I have a number of hobbies. I have always been a sports fanatic. I used to play tennis and cricket. Now I have taken up golf. I wish to become good at it.

[Ilyashenko] What about fishing?

[Hawke] Oh, I love it. It is very therapeutic to get on the water. This frees us from the stupidity of our world and we simply fish. It is particularly good if you are with a good companion. Fishing is perhaps the best form of rest in the world.

[Ilyashenko] Thank you very much for the interview.

[Hawke] Thank you.

Shevardnadze, Ambassador Discuss Visit

LD281512 Moscow Tass in English 1219 GMT 28 Nov 87

[Text] Moscow November 28 TASS—Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, received Australian ambassador to the USSR Charles Robin Ashwin at the latter's request. Views were exchanged on a number of issues, which have mutual interest, including those connected with the forthcoming official visit to the USSR by Australian Prime Minister Robert Hawke.

Leaves Canberra

LD271057 Moscow TASS in English 1050 GMT 27 Nov 87

[Text] Sydney November 27 TASS—Prime Minister Robert Hawke of Australia left today on an official visit to the USSR at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

In a statement to newsmen at the airport in Canberra he said he welcomed the forthcoming signature of a Soviet-American agreement on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles. On his way to Moscow the Australian prime minister will stop over in Singapore where he will confer with the leaders of that country.

Hayden Arrives in Moscow

BK280630 Melbourne Domestic Service in English 0500 GMT 28 Nov 87

[Text] The foreign affairs minister, Mr Hayden, has arrived in Moscow. Mr Hayden is due to have a series of meetings with Soviet trade officials and then link up with the prime minister, Mr Hawke, for his official visit.

Mr Hawke is in Singapore today on his way to Leningrad and Moscow. He will confer with a number of senior ministers in the Singapore Government. Earlier, Mr Hawke said he welcomed constructive Soviet involvement in the Asia-Pacific region.

Hawke Arrives in Moscow

LD300908 Moscow TASS in English 0846 GMT 30 Nov 87

[Text] Moscow November 30 TASS—Prime Minister Robert James Lee Hawke of Australia today arrived in Moscow on an official visit. He was invited by the Soviet Government.

At Vnukovo airport the prime minister of Australia and his wife were met by Nikolay Ryzhkov, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, and his wife, Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, foreign minister of the USSR, and other officials.

The guest arrived in the Soviet Union on Sunday and made a stop in Leningrad.

Hawke Arrives in Leningrad

LD290546 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0521 GMT 29 Nov 87

[Text] Leningrad, 29 Nov (TASS)—Robert James Lee Hawke, the Australian prime minister, arrived in Leningrad today on his way to Moscow for an official visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

Kamentsev Greets Hawke

LD291558 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 29 Nov 87

[Text] Australian Prime Minister Robert James Lee Hawke, who is going to Moscow for an official visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government, arrived in Leningrad today. At Pulkovo Airport the prime minister was met by Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; Khodyrev, chairman of the Leningrad

Gorispolkom; Samoteykin, USSR ambassador to Australia; and other officials. Among those who met him was Ashwin, Australian ambassador to the USSR. The state flags of Australia, the USSR, and the RSFSR were flying at the airport.

The head of the Australian Government paid a visit to the Leningrad Gorispolkom. At Piskarevo memorial cemetery he honored the memory of the citizens of Leningrad and servicemen who perished in the Great Patriotic War and laid a wreath at the monument to the mother-homeland. The guest visited Petropavlovskaya Fortress and Isaakievskiy Cathedral Museum and viewed the Hermitage picture collection.

Australian-Soviet Human Rights Pact Doubted

BK300714 Melbourne Overseas Service in English 0500 GMT 30 Nov 87

[Text] Australian officials say they are doubtful about the possibility of Australia and the Soviet Union signing a key human rights agreement during this week's visit to Moscow by the Australian prime minister, Mr Hawke. The agreement between the two countries is expected to be one of the main topics of Mr Hawke's talks with Soviet leaders as part of his 4-day visit to the Soviet Union. Mr Hawke will also discuss East-West relations and trade.

On the 1st day of his visit, Mr Hawke accepted a Soviet offer to loan 30 paintings from Leningrad's Heritage Museum. The paintings are expected to be on tour in Australia next March.

SRV Defense Minister Receives Admiral Kurik

LD261018 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0932 GMT 26 Nov 87

[Text] Hanoi, 26 Nov (TASS)—The official friendly visit by a detachment of Soviet warships to the SRV is continuing.

Army General Le Duc Anh, member of the CPV Central Committee Politburo and minister of national defense, welcomed Rear-Admiral Anatoliy Kurik, commander of the detachment, and stressed that the visit will promote the further strengthening of the traditional ties of friendship between the sailors and servicemen of the armed forces of the USSR and the SRV.

Vice-Admiral Giap Van Chong, commander of the SRV Navy, took part in the meeting.

Envoy Hands Gromyko Message To Aquino

LD272049 Moscow TASS in English 2022 GMT 27 Nov 87

[Text] Manila November 27 TASS—Oleg Sokolov, ambassador of the USSR to the Philippines, handed over on Thursday to Corazon Aquino, president of the Republic of the Philippines, a message by Andrey Gromyko, president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The concept of all-embracing peace and interantional security formulated by the Soviet Union is based on new thinking and is a comprehensive programme of practical measures to develop constructive interaction among states aimed, first and foremost, at removing the threat of a nuclear war, arresting the arms race and at disarmament, the message says. The understanding reached between the USSR and the United States on eliminating medium-range and shorter-range missiles to be sealed at a Soviet-U.S. summit meeting was a major breakthrough on the way towards its realization. This is the first and an exceptionally important step toward a real reduction in nuclear arsenals. We will be working with persistence for specific results in such an overriding issue as reduction in strategic offensive armaments as well and in preventing the outreach of weapons into space. People in the Soviet Union note with satisfaction that these efforts meet with understanding and draw an interested and positive response on the part of the Philippines, the government headed by you.

Reflecting on how to take the world out of its present dangerous state, one inevitably gives thought to questions of mutual understanding and trust among countries and peoples, the message says furthermore. One thing is obvious to us: The key to shaping out a new type of relationships among states is in promoting mutual understanding and confidence, and hence, in shedding the stereotypes formed, the distorted image of some or other side and its policy.

Our ideas of the ways to ensure peace and security in the Asia-Pacific region are reflected in the Vladivostok speech by Mikhail Gorbachev, developed and concretized in his speeches in New Delhi and in an interview with the newspaper *Merdeka*. We do not lay claim to putting forward ready-made recipes for solving all existing problems. This requires collective reason and experience of states and peoples whom we invite for a dialogue.

The message underlies the great importance attached by the Soviet leadership to relations with the Republic of the Philippines, expresses readiness for their extension in all directions, which would benefit the peoples of our countries and be in the interests of promoting peace and mutually profitable cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region.

One would like Soviet-Philippine relations to become one more example of how two states with different social systems and relying on the principles of equality, mutual profit, respect for sovereignty and strict non-interference in internal affairs can successfully develop mutual cooperation, certainly without damaging our relations with other countries.

In conclusion Andrey Gromyko wished President Carazon Aquino and the whole of the Philippine people prosperity and progress.

Near East & South Asia

DRA Grand Assembly Begins Session 29 Nov

Najibullah Address

LD291407 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1210 GMT 29 Nov 87

[Text] Kabul, 29 Nov (TASS)—The Loya Jirgah (Grand Assembly) began work in the Afghan capital today. Some 1350 delegates will discuss and ratify the new Afghan constitution and will elect the president of the Republic. In all, 1860 people are present at the jirga, representativs of the opposition forces being among those invited.

Delivering a report entitled "The new constitution is a constitution of national democracy and reconciliation", Najibullah, general secretary of the PDPA Central Committee and chairman of the DRA Revolutionary Council, stressed that in its content and its lofty aspirations, the Loya Jirgah could be called the jirga of peace, for its aim is to create a legislative basis for ending the fratricidal war.

He pointed to the enormous work done by the constitutional commission, whose members included 75 of the most authoritative representatives of the clergy, tribal leaders, workers, peasants, ministers, representatives of the PDPA and of the trade unions, the National Front, young peple, scientists, teachers, former deputies of parliament, craftsmen, traders, lawyers, and others. More than 2 million people took part in the nationwide discussions. More than once we have invited the opposition to make their remarks, to meet with us anywhere, and to discuss our differences. However, we have received no reply. The uncompromising enemies of national reconciliation have remained silent, although we know how interested they were in the enemy camp to read the draft constitution.

The Revolutionary Council now operating has played a most important role, particularly in the complex conditions of the first few years of the revolution. However, in conditions of national reconciliation, it can no longer ensure the representation of the very broadest masses of the population. The multi-party situation, the PDPA's renunciation of its monopoly on power, and the results of the local elections a year ago have given rise to the need for a democratic procedure for forming the supreme body of state power. This body will be the National Council.

As far as the name of the state is concerned, Najibullah went on to note, quite a lot of suggestions have been received on this question, too, and often they are in direct opposition to each other. The commission has studied them carefully and has decided to recommend to the Loya Jirgah that in future the state should be named the Republic of Afghanistan. An overwhelming majority of delegates voted in favor of naming the country the Republic of Afghanistan.

We have not only announced a policy of (?national) reconciliation, Najibullah said, but we have also exerted maximum efforts in order to accelerate it and to end the fratricidal bloodshed, the undeclared war, and the interference by international reaction in the internal affairs of our homeland. Our purpose in this has been highly humane—that of ensuring the supreme right of every person, the right to life under conditions of peace.

The adoption of the new basic law, which secures the principles of peace and concord as the norm of life of Afghan society, is an event, the significance of which goes beyond the borders of our homeland. We are on the side of those who act in these conditions according to the will of reason and not from standpoints of egoistical emotions and ambitions. The idea of national peace, concord, and cooperation, which has been written in the new constitution, is a part of mankind's universal desire for peace and a better life and is an important element of the new political thinking.

Alongside the principles of independence, unity, integrity, and sovereignty of the state, we have also included fundamental principles like nonalignment in the articles of the draft.

We have no preconditions for establishing and developing mutually advantageous links with other countries and peoples. We are striving to establish a zone not only of peace, but also of trading cooperation along the whole perimenter of our border, which will undoubtedly have a positive effect on the whole situation in the region, Najibullah said. We once again confirm our sincere desire to establish good relations with our immediate neighbors, Pakistan and Iran, and call upon them to reestablish peace and security in our troubled region by common efforts, guided by political realism and good will.

The historical fate of our motherland is closely tied with our great northern neighbor, the Soviet Union. The Land of the Soviets was the first to hold out to us the hand of friendship and unselfish help in 1919 when our people rose up in the struggle for independence. It has given us inestimable all-round help in building many national economy facilities, in training national cadres, and in strengthening our defense capacity. It is indeed the land of the Soviets which came to our assistance at our request, when our independence and territorial integrity were threatened. Our people, present and future generations, will always remember the feat of the Soviet soldiers-internationalists who shielded our home and our life with their breast. Today we see it as our sacred internationalist responsibility and national-patriotic duty to speed up the Soviet forces' limited contingent's return to the motherland by specific deeds in implementing the policy of national reconciliation. We shall also work persistently in this direction at the Geneva Afghan-Pakistani talks, striving for their successful completion.

Najibullah Elected President

LD301509 Moscow TASS in English 1501 GMT 30 Nov 87

[Text] Kabul November 30 TASS—Najibullah was today elected president of the Republic of Afghanistan. The unanimous decision was taken at the Loya Jirgah (council), currently under way in Kabul.

Delegates, speaking in the debate, observed that Najibullah's candidature met all demands placed by the constitution upon the head of state.

Assembly Approves Constitution

LD301004 Moscow TASS in English 0928 GMT 30 Nov 87

[Text] Kabul November 30 TASS—The new constitution of the Republic of Afghanistan was approved today by delegates of the Loya Jirgah which is under way now in Kabul. The new fundamental law of the country was unanimously voted in by all the delegates of the Loya Jirgah.

Najibullah Receives Soviet Planning Official

LD212027 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1831 GMT 21 Nov 87

[Text] Kabul, 21 Nov (TASS)—Najibullah, general secretary ofthe PDPA and president of the DRA Revolutionary Council today, received P.A. Paskar, first deputy chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee who is in Afghanistan at the head of a delegation on a working visit.

As reported by the *Bakhtar* agency, matters of bilateral relations were discussed during the conversation.

Najibullah Honors Soviet Troops in DRA

PM231235 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 11 Nov 87 Second Edition p 3

[Dispatch by unnamed TASS correspondent: "Commemorative Banner Presented"]

[Text] Kabul, 10 Nov—At a ceremony held here Najibullah, general secretary of the PDPA Central Committee and chairman of the DRA Revolutionary Council, presented personnel of the Limited Contingent of Soviet Troops in Afghanistan with the PDPA Central Committee Commemorative Banner for exemplary performance of their international duty on Afghan soil.

Your assistance, support, and revolutionary solidarity, the Afghan leader stressed when addressing the Soviet servicemen, inspire us Afghans in the struggle for an independent, integral, and nonaligned Afghanistan. The people of Afghanistan express to all the internationalist servicemen their sincere feeling of gratitude for the selfless assistance afforded them in defending the gains of the April Revolution and in carrying out the policy of national reconciliation. Our people will always harbor deep gratitude in their hearts to the internationalist servicemen and all Soviet people.

P. Mozhayev, USSR ambassador to the DRA, and representatives of the Limited Contingent of Soviet troops in Afghanistan attended the ceremony.

USSR, DRA Sign Cpoperation Protocol 22 Nov

LD230527 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1920 GMT 22 Nov 87

[Text] Today in Kabul the working protocol of the seventh session of the Soviet-Afghan subcommission on cooperation in planning was signed. Our correspondent in Afghanistan, Aleksandr Shkirando, reports:

[Shkirando] The Soviet-Afghan subcommission on planning works within the structure of the permanent intergovernmental commission for economic cooperation of 1982. Its tasks include cooperation between the USSR State Planning Committee and the DRA State Planning Committee. The session of this subcommission takes place annually. At the seventh session, which took place in Kabul from 16 to 22 November, the long-term development programs for the most important sectors in the Afghan economy for the period following 1990 was examined. Among these sectors industry, power engineering, agriculture and irrigation, transport and communications, as well as the social sphere were given special attention. Other important problems examined during the session and registered in the working protocol included the training of national cadres of Afghanistan in planning through advanced economics courses under the USSR State Planning Committee. All the participants in the session noted that the protocol signed will become another important stage in strengthening and broadening cooperation between our two countries.

Pakistan's Atomic Bomb, U.S. 'Aid' Scored

LD280054 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1930 GMT 27 Nov 87

[Boris Andrianov commentary]

[Text] UPI reports from Washington that Pakistan has achieved considerable success in the creation of its own atom bomb, and may already possess and have tested a nuclear device. In reporting this the U.S. news service cites the opinion of military experts and the reports of U.S. intelligence bodies. Boris Andrianov is at the microphone.

This is not the first time that the U.S. mass information media have carried reports that the Pakistan regime has come up to the threshold beyond which the possibility opens up for it to possess nuclear weapons. However, reports of this kind are being received with particular pain by the Washington adminstration. The reason is that the question of how far Pakistan's nuclear program has progressed has arisen in connection with the U.S. authorities' intention to provide the Islamabad regime with a fresh package of military and economic aid totalling over $4 billion. But under U.S. legislation such aid cannot be extended to states which are conducting work aimed at possessing nuclear weapons. This ban is contained in the Symington-Glenn Amendment, which was adopted back in 1976.

However, throughout the past 6 years the White House has managed to convince Congress not to apply the provisions of this amendment to Pakistan. Official Washington has thus actually been turning a blind eye to Islamabad's nuclear ambitions. Indeed, it is by no means fortuitous that Islamabad has been stubbornly refusing to sign the nuclear weapons nonproliferation treaty.

The point, however, is that the period of time in which the congressional decision on extending aid to Pakistan would apply expired about 2 months ago, this situation has proved very inconvenient for the White House. On the one hand the Reagan administration has been promising the Ziaul Haq regime that a fresh stage in U.S. military supplies would be started. On the other it has to provide these supplies by the back door, since it is unable now, with absolute reliability, to assure the legislators on Capitol Hill that Pakistan is not creating its so-called Islamic atom bomb. Indeed, how can such assurances be given if the rulers of the Pakistan regime are openly boasting about their success in the sphere of their nuclear program? President Ziaul Haq himself smugly stated in an interview for the U.S. *Time* magazine: You may say that Pakistan is capable of making a bomb when it so wishes. And, as though clarifying when such a wish may appear, in another interview he explained: We will not create a bomb while the United States is providing us with military and economic aid. Clarifications of this kind smack of open blackmail, the implication being that, if you stop assisting us, we will have our own atom bomb: You must choose which of the two it is going to be. Judging by all the signs, Washington has already made its choice: The Reagan administration is calling on Congress to turn a blind eye to the Islamabad regime's nuclear plans and to agree to continue assisting Pakistan.

The reason for such behavior by the White House is quite obvious. After all, bandits have entrenched themselves on Pakistan soil, and it is through them that Washington is waging its undeclared war against Afghanistan. This is the factor representatives of the U.S. Administration consider to be most important at present, UPI points out.

Quest for Southern Asian Stability Viewed

PM231439 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Nov 87 First Edition p 4

[V. Shurygin article: "Southern Asia: Path to Stability"]

[Text] The resolution of conflict situations remains one of the world community's most important tasks. As M.S. Gorbachev's article "Reality and Guarantees of a Secure World" points out, "...at all stages of a conflict it is necessary to make wide use of all means for the peaceful settlement of disputes and disagreements between states and to make offers of good services and mediation to achieve an armistice." The recently concluded agreement between Indian Prime Minister R. Gandhi and Sri Lankan President J. Jayewardene to settle the ethnic conflict which has been going on in the island republic for approximately 4 years was the result of such a constructive approach by interested parties.

The active peacemaking steps by the two states' leaders are all the more significant against the background of acute internal political crises, sallies by extremists and separatists, border incidents, and armed conflicts—everything that has become commonplace in recent years in the chronicle of the events occurring in Southern Asian countries.

What is the cause of this state of affairs in that part of the world, one of the most densely populated regions, where approximately 1 billion people live? It is hard to give a simple answer to this question, above all, because these and other negative phenomena in the life of Southern Asian peoples are the result of many interacting factors. These include the legacy of the colonial past, the unresolved nature of socioeconomic and ethnic problems, the internal political struggle, and, finally, the subversive activity of external forces interested in preserving the situation of instability, enmity, and suspicion in the region. Pursuing a "divide and rule" policy, they resort to this favorite method whenever development trends in a particular country or overall processes in the region threaten their interests.

India, whose independent foreign policy course runs counter to the Western powers' imperial ambitions, is the object of particularly active subversive intrigues. Their purpose is to make that country follow in the wake of their policy or, as a last resort, weaken it to such an extent that it cannot exert a special influence on the course of events in the region and in the world as a whole. No easy task, to put it bluntly. Therefore, in order to fulfill it, various forces and means have been mobilized—levers of economic pressure and subversive activity aimed at creating a hostile encirclement around India. All this is having an adverse effect on the situation in the country.

For several years now there has been continuing tension in the state of Punjab. Subversive forces are also active in another strategically important part of India, in the northeast of the country—in the states of Assam, Nagaland, Mizoram, Tripura, and others. Various kinds of extremist separatist organizations have been continuing their activities there for many years, conflicts arise, and antigovernment actions are provoked, accompanied by acts of violence and terror. Intercommunity relations have been exacerbated.

Such phenomena in the life of India also have their socioeconomic roots. The process of society's modernization with the development of capitalism is undermining the foundations of the feudal and prefeudal relations which are the mainstay of the forces of obscurantism and reaction. In their desire to preserve their privileged position by any means they turn, above all, to religious fanaticism, fan nationalist passions, and provoke intercaste clashes.

The economic development of individual parts of the country is also proceeding extremely unevenly. As a result, there is intensified rivalry among groups of the bourgeoisie for the redistribution of resources and spheres of application of capital. In the Punjab, for example, there are, above all, contradictions between the big Sikh farmers who have grown rich as a result of the "green revolution" and the traditionally Hindu urban merchant bourgeoisie. Avoiding the subdivision of plots of land, young Sikhs move to the city and acquire an education there, but they frequently cannot apply their strength and knowledge and become unemployed. It is from among these, above all, that the separatists recruit militant terrorists.

The majority of the aforementioned factors are also characteristic of other countries of the subcontinent, particularly Sri Lanka. The ethnic conflict that arose there threatened to escalate into a great tragedy for the island republic and into a serious hotbed of tension in the region.

It did not prove easy to implement the Indian-Sri Lankan accords that had been reached. The leaders of the extremist "Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam" [LTTE] organization undertook an attempt to wreck the agreement. They broke their promise to observe its terms and unleashed a campaign of terror against the peaceful Sinhalese population and also against their fellow tribesmen in other organizations who refused to obey their diktat. Armed attacks were also made on subunits of the Indian peacekeeping troops. Indian units had to mount a broad military operation to break the resistance of the LTTE militants in the north and east of the country.

The relations between India and Pakistan are one of the factors determining the political climate in Southern Asia. Today they are characterized by tension and suspicion. The chief cause of this is external, namely the clearly expressed U.S. desire to make Pakistan its assistant in implementing its neoglobalist policy in the Asia and Pacific region. This country's territory has already become a bridgehead of the "undeclared war" against Afghanistan. This, however, is by no means the full extent of Islamabad's role in Washington's global strategy.

Circles close to the Pentagon speak of the attraction of Pakistani territory for stationing the U.S. "Rapid Deployment Force," of the fact that Pakistani soldiers, on instructions from across the ocean, could fulfill gendarme functions in the region, and of the ports of Gwadar, Karachi, and others that would be convenient for the U.S. Navy. Through Pakistan U.S. political strategists would like to influence public opinion in the Muslim world and the nonaligned movement.

This is why the Reagan administration shows such concern for the regime which marked its accession to power by depriving the people of the most elementary democratic rights. This is why the leaders of the White House, violating the laws of their own country, connive at the Pakistani regime's nuclear ambitions and provide it with the latest offensive arms—which is changing the correlation of forces in the region and whipping up the arms race.

By all accounts, the Pakistanis are reluctant to accept the role allocated them by the United States. The antigovernment actions by representatives of various sections of the local public, which have been continuing all these years, are increasingly assuming an anti-American nature.

Imperialism will continue to do everything possible to disunite the peoples of Southern Asia and instill an atmosphere of tension in relations among them. However, there, just as throughout the world, the trend toward good-neighborliness and the development of mutually advantageous ties is increasingly persistently making headway. This process is reflected in the creation of the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC), which embraces all the countries of the region.

The first summit meeting of SAARC members was held in Dhaka, the Bangladesh capital, at the end of 1985. The documents adopted proclaimed the organization's chief aim to be the acceleration of economic and social progress in the countries of Southern Asia by making the optimum use of their human and material resources.

"The establishment of the SAARC," the Indian newspaper *Hindustan Times* wrote, "is the most significant of all the recent events in the region." It is impossible to disagree with that assessment. For if the provisions of the program documents are consistently implemented, a serious contribution can be made to ensuring peace and stability in Southern Asia and resolving many complex problems—both inherited from the colonial past and stemming from the subversive actions of imperialism and its allies. Of course, this is no easy matter, as evidenced by the recent routine meeting of heads of state and government of the SAARC member countries in Kathmandu. There serious disagreements among them came to light in their approaches to a number of regional and international problems. Nevertheless, the forum participants succeeded in signing an agreement to establish a regional food fund and a convention on combating terrorism. They welcomed the reaching of a Soviet-U.S. accord in principle to conclude a treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles and expressed the hope that it will be the precursor of a radical reduction in strategic arms and of preventing the arms race from moving into space.

During his tour of countries of the Asia and Pacific region Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi called for the activation of cooperation between the SAARC and ASEAN (which includes Brunei, Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand, and the Philippines). The importance and the constructive nature of the Soviet proposals advanced in Vladivostok for ensuring peace and security in the Asia and Pacific region were noted during an exchange of opinions.

The role of Asian states, including the countries of Southern Asia, in world affairs is growing constantly. It will undoubtedly be still greater if positive trends prevail in relations among them. This is why the deepening of the political dialogue in the region, further steps to create an atmosphere of good-neighborliness and cooperation there, and the prevention of imperialist interference are so important today. This is the real path to the resolution of conflict situations and to reliable security and stability.

Jordan's King Receives Visiting Soviets

LD241834 Moscow TASS in English 1455 GMT 24 Nov 87

[Text] Amman November 24 TASS—The only way to establish a fair and all-embracing peace in the region is by convening an international conference on the Middle East which should be attended by all the sides involved in the conflict, as well as five countries—permanent members of the United Nations Security Council. This statement was made by King of Jordan Husayn at a meeting with the Soviet delegation which takes part in the Days of the USSR in Jordan. Touching upon the situation in the Persian Gulf Zone, King Husayn emphasised the need for an immediate implementation of Resolution 598 of the United Nations Security Council.

USSR Delegation Leaves for PDRY Celebrations

LD281046 Moscow TASS in English 1015 GMT 28 Nov 87

[Text] Moscow November 28 TASS—A Soviet delegation led by Pavel Gilashvili, vice president of the presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, left Moscow for Aden today to attend celebrations marking the 20th anniversary of the proclamation of the independence of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen.

Soviet Naval Vessels Conclude Visit to Aden

LD241127 Moscow TASS in English 0743 GMT 24 Nov 87

[Text] Aden November 24 TASS—A group of Soviet naval ships including the big anti-submarine warfare vessel *Admiral Tributz* and the destroyer *Boyevoy* has ended an official friendly visit to the capital of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen (PDRY).

"Fruitful relations between our countries are a guarantee that the ideas of the Great October Revolution will continue to be successfully translated into reality in Democratic Yemen," 'Ali Salim al-Bid, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Yemen Socialist Party (YSP), said as he received Rear-Admiral Vasiliy Sergeyev, commander of the group.

The Soviet ships were visited by Yasin Sa'id Nu'man, a member of the Political Bureau of the YSP Central Committee and prime minister of the PDRY, Muhammad Sa'id 'Abd-Allah Muhsin, a member of the Political Bureau and a secretary of the YSP Central Committee, Colonel Salih 'Ubayd Ahmad, an alternate member of the Political Bureau of the YSP Central Committee and defense minister of the PDRY, and 'Abd al-'Aziz al-Dali, foreign minister of the PDRY.

The crews also hosted troops of this country's armed forces and representatives of the people of Aden. The Soviet seamen gave an amateur talent concert, which was warmly received by Aden residents, and took part in friendly sport competitions.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Zambia's Kenneth Kaunda Continues Visit

Received by Gorbachev

PM301339 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Nov 87 Second Edition p 1

[TASS Report: "Meeting Between M. S. Gorbachev and K. Kaunda"]

[Text] Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, met on 27 November with Kenneth Kaunda, president of Zambia and president of the United National Independence Party (UNIP), in the USSR on a friendly working visit.

Greeting the visitor, Gorbachev expressed the confidence that the visit and talks in Moscow would promote mutual understanding and further development of Soviet-Zambian cooperation in the interests of peace and progress.

During their conversation Gorbachev described the restructuring drive which reflected the essence of Soviet domestic policy. Its aim was to draw the people into active participation in running all affairs of our state and societ. When we say that "more socialism" is required, we also mean more democracy.

Soviet people understand and feel that. They stand firm for restructuring which they nurtured, which they conceived literally in suffering.

Informing Kaunda about the process of renewal affecting all aspects of life of Soviet society, currently under way in the Soviet Union, Gorbachev pointed out that restructuring, invigoration of the Soviet Union's domestic political life, had stepped up the initiative of the USSR's foreign policy and impelled the international community to ponder on the destinies of peace, on the social choice and on the character of international relations.

"At the present crucial stage in mankind's history, when it is threatened with destruction," M. S. Gorbachev said, "removing the threat of nuclear war and creating foundations for a comprehensive system of international peace and security constitute the chief direction in the foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state. The conclusion of a treaty on medium-range and operational-tactical missiles during the forthcoming visit to Washington and advancement on other issues on the agenda of the Soviet-American summit can help attain these objectives."

K. Kaunda welcomed the agreement to eliminate the two classes of nuclear missiles. You, he said, addressing M. S. Gorbachev, are performing a great mission of peace and we highly value your efforts. Your policy is a profoundly honest one. Please continue your peace-loving mission, which is particularly important today, at a time when the world is confronted by the threat of nuclear annihilation.

The sides gave much attention to problems of southern Africa where, through the fault of the Western-backed racist regime, there existed a dangerous seat of international tension. It was noted that in saving that regime, the West was trying to save its own profits which it was pumping out of African countries and many other developing nations in other continents.

The Soviet Union, Gorbachev said, backed the right of every nation to choose ways and forms of its development on its own. Its sympathies and solidarity were on the side on the peoples in the Frontline States, on the side of the peoples which had chosen a path of independence and progress.

The efforts to defuse the conflict situation in the world call for non-standard atitudes, a new political thinking based on the realities, on due regard for the interests of all sides. This approach finds its expression, in particular, in the proposals directed at national reconciliation in Afghanistan and a political settlement around Afghanistan. The principle of political settlement is quite applicable also to the resolution of problems in southern Africa. If guarantees are required for reaching a political settlement, it would be possible to think about such guarantees on the part of the United Nations Organization, the permanent member countries of the U.N. Security Council. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it is prepared to play its positive role on this issue.

President Kenneth Kaunda expressed gratitude to the Soviet Union for its invariable support for the just fight waged by the peoples of the Frontline States against the aggressive policy of the apartheid regime, their efforts in search of a political settlement of the issue.

President Kaunda asked about the state of Soviet-Chinese relations.

Mikhail Gorbachev answered that the Soviet people entertain friendly feelings towards the Chinese people, towards great China, which is our neighbor and with which many things link us. The Soviet-Chinese relations are developing in various fields. Their further improvement and development will indisputably serve towards improving the whole international climate, the whole system of international relations, will make it possible to resolve successfully many questions pertaining to the development of cooperation between the nations of the Asia-Pacific region. As is known, the ideas expressed in Vladivostok about the settlement of topical issues of the region are a source of much interest and meet with broad support.

The Soviet leadership drew attention to the statement by Deng Xiaoping in the conversation with Takako Doi, chairman of the Central Executive Committee of the Socialist Party of Japan, about his readiness to meet with the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. We have said more than once that such a meeting also accords with our desire, and that it could be held in Moscow, Beijing or any other convenient place. The Chinese side is known to stipulate the holding of such a meeting by preliminary elimination of obstacles, referring first and foremost to a Cambodian settlement, but meetings between statemen are held precisely to discuss and solve complex issues of bilateral and international relations. Thus, for example, we have by far more disputable problems between ourselves and the USA, yet this does not prevent Soviet-American summit contacts, the holding of a third meeting with President Reagan. This does not prevent Chinese-American talks either.

I would like to say once again that the Soviet-Chinese relations are developing. We welcome that and wish the Chinese people every success in their endeavor, in building socialism.

The president of Zambia, the UNIP president invited the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee to go on an official visit to the Republic of Zambia. The invitation was accepted with gratitude.

The meeting proceeded in an atmosphere of mutual understanding and frankness.

Leaves for Leningrad

LD271334 Moscow TASS in English 1242 GMT 27 Nov 87

[Text] Moscow November 27 TASS—President Kenneth David Kaunda of Zambia left Moscow for Leningrad today.

He has been in the USSR since Thursday on a friendly working visit.

The Zambian president was seen off at the airport by Andrey Gromyko, a member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Anatoliy Dobrynin, a secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and other officials.

Interviewed on Visit

LD282258 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2015 GMT 28 Nov 87

[Interview with Zambian President Kenneth David Kaunda by correspondent Farid Seyful-Mulyukov in Leningrad "before his departure"; Kaunda speaks in English, with superimposed Russian translation — recorded]

[Text] [Seyful-Mulyukov] Mr President, how do you assess the results of your meetings with the Soviet leadership?

[Kaunda] Comrades. My meetings with Soviet leaders have been extremely successful. You know that I have met Gorbachev, the general secretary, and President Gromyko and his colleagues. We discussed problems of large-scale politics. I would like to note that both meetings passed off very well. I should add that we in Zambia have great love and respect for Comrade Gorbachev, the Soviet leader. We believe that he is an honest man, trying to solve the problems that face him in a serious and sincere manner. We have a lot of respect for him. That is what I wanted to say about my meetings with Soviet leaders. They have gone extremely well. Thank you.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] Mr President, you have said that the nuclear threat knows neither ideological nor regional borders. I would like to know your point of view about the Soviet-U.S. accord on eliminating two classes of nuclear missiles.

[Kaunda] The nuclear threat is a threat to all mankind. All peoples, great and small, are subject to this threat. If a nuclear bomb is dropped on any state it will mean the end of the whole of mankind. Knowing full well that the nuclear bomb knows no borders, whether those of ideological or racial differences, but that it is capable of destroying the whole of mankind, we in Zambia fully support the position of Comrade Gorbachev on these problems. I am saying this not because I am in the Soviet Union. I have said the same thing in my own country, in Washington, in Vancouver, and in other places where I have been recently. We want the accord on nuclear issues between Comrade Gorbachev and President Reagan to be adopted by the whole of mankind. This is particularly important now, when the threat of nuclear destruction hangs over the world. We in Zambia, therefore, actively support Comrade Gorbachev, and President Reagan, who has not agreed with those forces in his own country which have come out against this nuclear agreement. We hope that President Reagan will continue to fight for peace, and if he leaves the White House that his successor, whoever he is, will also strive for peace throughout the world together with Comrade Gorbachev. We need this peace,for without it there will be nothing. We value highly, therefore, the efforts that are being made in this direction by Comrade Gorbachev and President Reagan, and we wish them success at the meeting in Washington which is due to take place next month.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] Mr President, as everyone knows,the Soviet Union has put forward and champions the idea of disarmament for the sake of development. What is your attitude to that idea?

[Kaunda] I have already expressed my attitude to this question. The stance taken by the Soviet leadership and all the Soviet people is important in many respects. Here in Leningrad I was shown several memorials to the heroes who died defending peace and Leningrad. If that thing happens again, there will be no Leningrad, no Washington, no London, no Bonn, no Lusaka, nothing. Our attitude to these questions is a very serious one, and our stance is that the peace proposals must be accepted by all mankind.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] And the last question: Do you agree that the principles of a political settlement are also completely applicable to the solution of the acute conflict situation in southern Africa?

[Kaunda] We in Zambia are in favor of a peaceful political solution to the problem of apartheid. I have twice met the premier of racist South Africa; perhaps you know, or perhaps you do not; in 1969, in Lusaka, there was a meeting of heads of state and government of the east Africa, central African and southern African countries. We adopted the so-called Lusaka agreement on southern Africa. That agreement said that to eliminate colonialism and racism in southern Africa, talks had to be started with the colonial powers and with the racism RSA regime, and that only if the peaceful path did not lead to success should we start an armed struggle. That is how we acted when the question of Angola and Mozambique was being decided: We entered into contact with the late Salazar and Caetano. I did that personally. However, we did not in fact receive a reply, so we were forced to fight, and Portuguese colonialism in Angola and Mozambique was destroyed. In Zimbabwe as it is now called — Rhodesia as it was before — we acted in the same way. We consistently tried a number of methods to try and form a transitional government and to bring about the transfer of power from the white minority to the black majority by peaceful means. In this we failed, so we began to fight, and in Zimbabwe the rule of the majority was established.

Now there is the question of Namibia. There is the UN resolution No 435 of 1978, which says that Namibia is a UN Mandate territory and that the RSA should leave it. But the RSA, leaning on the support of the Reagan administration, refused to do this. In search of peace, I met the premier of the racist RSA. I would like to stress again that the principles of political settlement are applicable to the solution of the problems in southern Africa; but we are coming up against a wall of resistance. Western countries, such as Great Britain, West Germany, France, and of course the USA have heavy investments in South Africa. Using the cheap labor of black workers, they are making enormous profits. They do not want the situation to change. South Africa contains rich reserves of strategic raw materials, and they do not want to lose them, so a very intensive struggle is going on there, and we do not know whether it will be possible to solve the problem by peaceful means. We want to solve it by peaceful means, but if we cannot, then there will be nothing left but to try to bring about its solution with weapons in our hands. That is how things stand today in southern Africa. Thank you, comrades.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] Thank you, Mr President, for giving this interview for Soviet television.

OAU Council of Ministers on Indebtedness

LD301017 Moscow TASS in English 0700 GMT 30 Nov 87

[Text] Addis Ababa November 30 TASS—TASS correspondent Gennadiy Gabrielyan reports:

The extraordinary session of the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) ended here on November 29 with the coordination of a joint position of African countries on matters concerning the external indebtedness, the growth of which has a destructive effect on the economy of the continent.

The session-endorsed recommendations on how to get out of the current crisis situation will be submitted for approval to an extraordinary session of the assembly of the heads of state and government of the OAU member-countries. The session opens here on today.

The council-adopted documents express serious concern over the fact that the debt crisis seriously hinders the implementation of the priority programme for advancing the African economy for 1986-1990. The programme had been adopted by the OAU in 1985.

The ministers stated that Africa did not intend to waive its debt obligations. However, the low level of export revenue makes it extremely difficult if not impossible to repay the existing debt.

Having agreed with the proposal of the Senegalese delegation, the ministers recommended that the all-African summit meeting seek a ten-year moratorium, and not a three-year one, on the payment of interest on the existing debts.

It is also suggested that interest rates for the repayment of the existing debts be reduced and the repayment of debts be prolonged for a period of 50 years with a ten-year deferment of payments, and that African countries be given an opportunity partially to repay the debt in national currencies.

Kozlovskiy Receives Zimbabwean Visitors

PM271423 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Nov 87 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS Report under the general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] A meeting took place 25 November between Ye. A. Kozlovskiy, chairman of the Soviet-African section of the USSR Parliamentary Group, and a delegation from the peace-loving public of Zimbabwe headed by Senator D. Mavhaire, member of the Zimbabwean African National Union-Popular Front Central Committee.

O. Ndangwa, Zimbabwean ambassador to the USSR, took part in the conversation.

East Europe

Polls Open in Polish Nationwide Referendum

LD290840 Moscow TASS in English 0837 GMT 29 Nov 87

[Text] Warsaw November 29 TASS—TASS correspondent Valentin Volkov reports:

Polling stations created by commissions for holding a nationwide referendum on the reform of the national economy and the state opened at 6.00 today in the morning all over the country. Participants in the referendum are to give a "yes" or "no" answer to two questions—on the methods and pace of transformations in the socio-economic sphere and on a further profound democratization of the public and political life.

The Polish people, every citizen of the country, is to make a choice today: either to create a foundation of a stable development of the country and a solid material wellbeing of the population in the coming two or three years by radical reforms, by living through a difficult period, or to preserve the present-day pace of development and to put off a period of overcoming difficulties for a longer perspective.

The results of the referendum will be valid if 50 per cent of people having the right to participate in the referendum plus one person answer in the affirmative each of the two questions.

Posters with the inscriptions "The Future of Poland Is in Our Hands" and "Yes to Progress and Democracy" hanging on the walls of buildings, in the windows and on tram-cars urge the Polish people to fulfil their civic duty.

Further Report

LD291748 Moscow TASS in English 1706 GMT 29 Nov 87

[Text] Warsaw November 23 TASS—A national referendum on issues which are of key importance to the future economic and socio-political life of the Republic has been held in Poland today.

Polling stations opened throughout the country since early in the morning. During the referendum the people are to give yes or no answers to two questions: On methods and pace of reforms in the socio-economic sphere and on further deep democratisation of socio-political life.

People of Poland should make the choice: either lay the foundations of a stable development of the country and solid material well-being of the population in the coming two or three years through radical reforms and by living through a difficult period, or, keeping the previous pace, to put off the prospect of overcoming difficulties to a more distant future.

The results of the referendum will be valid of 50 per cent of persons who have the right to participate in the referendum plus one vote will answer each of the two questions in the affirmative.

The present referendum is the second one in the history of People's Poland. The idea to hold it was proposed by the Patriotic Movement of National Rebirth. This initiative was supported by the Polish United Workers' Party (PUWP) and other allied parties and by socio-political organizations.

The referendum followed extensive and in-depth preparations. PUWP and government leaders had numerous meetings with work collectives and groups of citizens, explaining the essence of reforms and their importance for further successful development of Poland along the socialist road. At the same time it was pointed out that the process of reforms was inseparable from action against those who reject any positive initiatives.

Anti-socialist elements and, in particular, those from among the leadership of the former 'Solidarity' became active shortly before the referendum. They tried to sow distrust of the projected reforms. Their statements were picked up by Western subversive radio voices, with the Free Europe being most zealous. It is noteworthy that literally before the referendum the U.S. Congress decided to allocate a million dollars for subversive elements in Poland.

On the eve of the referendum *Trybuna Ludu, Rzeczpospolita*, and other leading newspapers emphasised that the process of transformations taking place in Poland was not only a Polish phenomenon but also the natural outcome of the present state of development which manifests itself in most socialist countries.

"Radical reforms", *Trybuna Ludu* emphasises, "is a necessity, for possibilities for achieving progress through existing means are being exhausted. It is essential to effect reforms quickly and consistently. To put off or delay them means to complicate the situation".

Final results of the referendum will be announced on November 30.

Turnout for Referendum

LD300956 Moscow TASS in English 0639 GMT 30 Nov 87

[Text] Warsaw November 30 TASS—The doors of the polling stations throughout Poland were closed at 22:00 local time Sunday. The commissions on the holding of a nationwide referendum on the reform of the economy and the state got down to the counting of votes. They are to find out what per cent of the eligible citizens of the Polish People's Republic voted "yes" at the referendum responding to two questions: On methods and pace of transformations in the socio-economic sphere and on a further profound democratization of socio-political life. The results of the referendum will have mandatory power in case 50 per cent of the eligible voters cast an affirmative vote on each of the two questions.

The turnout was not equal in various provinces of the country, referendum commissions reported. The latest figures for 20 hours show that the turnout was over 60 per cent everywhere and in some places even over 70 per cent. The referendum was held in a calm and business-like atmosphere. The sporadic attempts by small groups of extremist-minded thugs to provoke street unrest outside four to five churches in Warsaw, Krakow and Wroclaw were not supported by the population.

Jerzy Urban Comments

LD301009 Moscow TASS in English 0639 GMT 30 Nov 87

[Text] Warsaw November 30 TASS—The subversive broadcasting station Free Europe has unleashed an extremely intensive campaign in connection with a referendum in Poland. This was stated by Jerzy Urban, official spokesman of the Polish Government for the press, at a press conference here Sunday.

It is obvious that the purpose of the campaign is to persuade the population to boycott the referendum, to distort the meaning of the reforms in Poland and to convince people that they were useless. Groups of people or separate individuals ready to denigrate the essence of the transformations were used for this purpose. Each of their statements was broadcast many times over, accompanied by commentaries of the broadcasting station.

"The Polish leaders submitted for the nationwide referendum the program of transformations", the government spokesman said. "However, Free Europe is trying to grossly interfere in the actions of the Polish people urging them to oppose the reforms. This can be described as an act of subversion on the part of the U.S. propaganda centre". Urban exposed lies and deception contained in the reports of a number of Western agencies about the referendum in Poland.

Ryzhkov Meets With Poland's Szalajda

LD271523 Moscow TASS in English 1446 GMT 27 Nov 87

[Text] Moscow November 27 TASS—Today practical questions of Soviet-Polish relations of great importance for the implementation of social and economic tasks facing the two countries were examined in the Kremlin by Nikolay Ryzhkov, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and Zbigniew Szalajda, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Polish Republic. He stays in the USSR on a working visit.

The sides noted during the talk that the reorganization of the economic mechanism, now under way in the two countries, would increase by far possibilities of Soviet-Polish interaction in all spheres of economic activities. Nikolay Ryzhkov informed Zbigniew Szalajda of the radical reform of economic management, in progress in the Soviet Union, transition of national economic industries to full cost-accounting, self-financing and enactment of the USSR Law on the State Enterprise (amalgamation). Zbigniew Szalajda described the implementation of the second stage of the economic reform in the Polish Republic.

The talk was held in a friendly atmosphere.

Bulgaria, Iran Start Parliamentary Relations

LD270814 Moscow TASS in English 0710 GMT 27 Nov 87

[Text] Sofia November 27 TASS—By TASS correspondent Vladimir Matyash:

Stanko Todorov, chairman of the National Assembly of Bulgaria, received on Thursday a parliamentary delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran visiting here.

During the meeting both sides expressed satisfaction with these first contacts between the parliamentarians of Bulgaria and Iran as well as conviction that they will lay firm foundation for cooperation of the two countries and exert a positive influence on expanding Bulgarian-Iranian relations in other fields as well.

During the meeting, Stanko Todorov noted that the friendly relations between Bulgaria and Iran were developing successfully. He reaffirmed the readiness of the Bulgarian side to expand relations with Iran.

The delegation of Iran's Majlis also had talks with the delegation of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the National Assembly of Bulgaria. It was stressed that the necessary prerequisites existed to expand cooperation with Iran on a stable long-term basis. In this connection, the importance was stressed of contacts between the two countries at different levels.

The Iranian MP's were acquainted with Bulgaria's foreign policy course aimed at strengthening peace and cooperation and settling the conflicts in different regions through peaceful means.

Bulgaria To Allow 'Unlimited' Poll Candidates

PM251615 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Nov 87 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Bulgaria: Draft Amendments to Election Law Published"]

[Text] Sofia, 24 Nov—Draft amendments to the election law prepared by the Bulgarian State Council and the National Council of the Fatherland Front have been published here for nationwide discussion.

The document emphasizes that the proposed amendments are aimed at further democratizing and improving the electoral system in keeping with the restructuring of economic and sociopolitical life in Bulgaria.

The draft law provides for the nomination, examination, and registration of an unlimited number of candidate deputies to people's councils for each electoral okrug or district. Party and social organizations and labor collectives may nominate joint candidates on behalf of the Fatherland Front. The number of candidates of this kind is unlimited. The point is made that the voters may vote for only one candidate deputy.

Romanian Fuel Shortage Problem Described

PM261121 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 19 Nov 87 p 4

[TASS correspondent A. Polunin dispatch, especially written for MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA, under the rubric "In the Socialist Countries' Capitals": "Regime of Savings. How the Fuel and Energy Problem Is Tackled in Bucharest"]

[Text] Bucharest—Much attention is being given in Romania to solving the fuel and energy problem and to ensuring steady work by gas stations, on which normal operations by the motor vehicle pool and public transport and citizens' private transportation depend.

The solution to this problem, the radio and press note, lies in building up the country's fuel and energy potential. This is one of the main questions set by the 13th RCP Congress.

There is strict accounting and monitoring of the consumption of every single liter of gasoline by enterprises, the motor vehicle pool, and transportation in Romania, which is striving to repay its debts to Western banks as soon as possible. For the purpose of savings, buses in the capital and several other cities run on natural gas instead of gasoline, which is advantageous not just from the financial viewpoint—there is less environmental pollution caused by exhaust fumes.

Owners of private transportation are the hardest hit by the "strict savings regime" of fuel. Cars in large cities are allowed not more than 80 liters, or two tanks full, of gasoline per month. An appropriate entry is made in the driver's ration book by gas station attendants. A special decree also imposes restrictions on the use of cars on holidays. Next Sunday, for example, there will be a ban on driving cars whose license plates end in an odd number, while "even" cars, as they are called here, will remain garaged or parked on the next holiday. This procedure will remain in force for 1 year. In practice, temporary prohibition on driving all "privates" during the winter has become firmly established in the last few years. City streets are deserted for a period of 2-3 months. The green light applies only to public and official transport.

Much attention is given to proper work by gas stations and the maintenance of order and discipline there. Journalists from the evening newspaper *Informatia Bucurestiului*, jointly with militia staffers, recently conducted spot checks at the capital's gas stations in the peak hours of the workday, when cars were forming long lines at the stations. The inspection showed that most "privates" tank up during working hours. The most "enterprising" leaders either send their subordinates for gas or do it themselves on the pretext of "travel to conference at higher-ranking institutions." This situation at the "peco" (as gas stations in Romania are known) can be combated only subject to strict observance of labor discipline and greater responsibility by production leaders at all levels, the newspaper writes.

Moscow TV Carries Documentary on Albania

LD282121 [Editorial report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 0655 GMT on 28 November 1987 carries a 30-minute documentary on Albania produced by the Moscow Central Documentary Film studios in 1986. The narrator explains that the film in the documentary was shot by Western television reporters. "Since 1962, none of our journalists, and virtually no Soviet person, has been to Albania." The narrator continues: "We wanted, after a long pause, to tell you something about this land and people, and about the history of Soviet-Albanian relations."

The program notes Albania's proclamation of independence in 1912 and marks out the main political and social events up to the present day. Speaking of the inception of USSR-Albanian relations, the narrator says: "As a result of the June revolution of 1924, the democratic government of Fan Noli came to power in Albania. Diplomatic relations were established between our countries. Soon, however, these relations were broken off. The Italian fascists started to interfere shamelessly in Albania's internal affairs." He goes on: "The Italian fascist state facilitated the inauguration of the reactionary President Ahmed Zog, who later, also with Rome's help, was proclaimed king of the Albanians. Reaction ruled for almost 15 years—15 long years."

Moving to World War II, the documentary shows archive film of the Italian invasion of Albania in 1939 and the German occupation in 1942. Enver Hoxha, then a partisan, is shown making the following appeal: "We here in enslaved Albania believe unshakeably in imminent liberation and say to the soldiers of the Red Army: Your struggle inspires us! Our antifascist struggle is just and sacred! We began it with blood, and we will drown barbarous fascism in blood!"

Film of the 1944 victory day in Albania is shown. The narrator says: "That outstanding Soviet commander, Marshal of the Soviet Union Georgiy Konstantinovich Zhukov, said: Separated be thousands of kilometers, we and the Albanians fought together for freedom, for a new life, for socialism." He continues: "We have always given and do give due credit to the struggle of the Albanian patriots against fascism and for the assertion of socialism, and this memory and the blood that has been spilled is a guarantee that the difficulties in our relations will certainly be overcome eventually. We are true to that memory."

Moving to the postwar period, the documentary shows some examples of Soviet-Albanian cooperation on construction sites, at a youth festival, and the export of agricultural equipment. The narrator says: "What is to be said about Albania today? We possess little film but what we have conveys an image of a new and modern country. Sometimes in Western newspapers, magazines, books, and radio broadcasts we read or hear condemnation of how the inhabitants of Albania are shut off, isolated from the outside world. Let us not oversimplify. Indeed, the familiar slogan about standing on one's own feet has determined and does determine much in the country's life." Shots of anti-aircraft weapons in farm fields are shown and the narrator continues: "These pictures make one think: concrete pillboxes and anti-aircraft weapons in peaceful peasant fields. Albania today has quite a few problems, and the Albanians themselves now speak about them openly and frankly. But the most important thing is that a very great deal has been done and achieved in the years of people's power."

The documentary next shows the funeral of Enver Hoxha. The narrator says: "In April 1985, Enver Hoxha ended his life's journey. His nearest and dearest are at his coffin. In those days of mourning, Ramiz Alia, a veteran of the antifascist struggle, was elected first secretary of the party Central Committee at a plenum of the Albanian Workers Party Central Committee. Albania stands in the middle of the eighties. Speaking of Soviet-Albanian relations, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stressed: Our country favors the normalization of relations with the People's Socialist Republic of Albania. Given goodwill on both sides, it would be possible to resolve this question in the interests of the peoples of both states and the cause of peace and socialism." The narrator continues: "That is our principled position. We respect the courageous people of Albania. We are prepared to put aside the differences of the past decades and to do our utmost so that friendship and fraternity between the peoples of our socialist countries will once more prevail."

The documentary closes with scenic views of the Albanian countryside as the narrator says: "And that is all that we are able to tell you in this short film about our friendship and about Albania, its cliffs, beaches, towns, villages, and people. May our first film for many years be a portent to new, joyful, and good encounters. We believe, we are confident, it will be so."

West Europe

Shevardnadze Receives UK Envoy Cartledge
LD261858 Moscow TASS in English 1836 GMT 26 Nov 87

[Text] Moscow November 26 TASS—Member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Foreign Minister of the USSR Eduard Shevardnadze today received Ambassador of Great Britain Bryan Cartledge at the latter's request. Some questions of Soviet-British relations were discussed.

AUCCTU Delegation Arrives in Britain
LD291807 Moscow TASS in English 1536 GMT 29 Nov 87

[Text] London November 29 TASS—A delegation of the All-Union Central Council of Soviet Trade Unions (AUCCTU) led by Stepan Shalayev, AUCCTU chairman, has arrived here at the invitation of the British Trade Unions Congress (TUC).

On the delegation are representatives of the AUCCTU, republican trade union organizations, and sectoral trade unions.

At the airport the delegation were met by Norman Willis, TUC general secretary, Fred Jarvis, TUC president, and by Leonid Zamyatin, the ambassador of the USSR to the United Kingdom.

This is the first visit to Britain by a Soviet high-ranking trade union delegation in recent years. The visit is being made in reply to the TUC delegation's trip to the USSR in April this year.

The Soviet delegation will hold talks with the leadership of British trade unions and representatives of the government on the problems of energy, will visit one of British nuclear power stations, and will tour industrial enterprises of Britain.

Belgium Announces Halt to Cruise Missile Work
LD272350 Moscow TASS in English 2026 GMT 27 Nov 87

[Text] Brussels November 27 TASS—All work on building infrastructure to deploy the remaining 32 out of 48 cruise missiles in the area of the Belgian city of Florennes will be frozen right after the signing of a Soviet-American treaty on elimination of INF, a spokesman of the Belgian National Defence Ministry told journalists today.

He pointed out that, though there was no exact date for a withdrawal of the 16 missiles deployed there, construction would be also stopped of the so-called American village of 650 dwelling houses for U.S. maintenance personnel.

EEC Foreign Ministers Meet in Brussels
LD291952 Moscow TASS in English 1856 GMT 29 Nov 87

[Text] Brussels November 29 TASS—TASS correspondent Leonid Timofeyev reports:

A two-day meeting of the ministers of foreign affairs of the European Economic Community (EEC) countries began in the Belgian capital today. The ministers will consider items which have been put on the agenda of the forthcoming December 4 session of the European Council of the Communities at the level of the heads and government [as received] in Copenhagen.

The need for such a meeting has been prompted by the remaining differences between the partners over the question of sources to finance the Common Market activities, over a single agricultural policy, and a number of other acute problems.

The foreign ministers of EEC Countries will discuss the draft compromise solutions submitted by Denmark as the presiding country in the EEC.

However, experts point out, the draft solutions bypass some acute issues which are certain to crop up at the meeting of the leaders of EEC countries.

Shevardnadze Receives West German Ambassador

LD281446 Moscow TASS in English 1239 GMT 28 Nov 87

[Text] Moscow November 28 TASS—Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, today received Andreas Meyer-Landrut, the ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany to the USSR, at the latter's request. The ambassador conveyed a personal message of the FRG Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl, addressed to Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

The conversation focused on some urgent international issues and bilateral relations between the USSR and FRG. Eduard Shevardnadze noted that the Soviet leadership stood for dynamism in those relations in the political, trade, economic and other fields. The ambassador stressed that the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany had the same intention.

FRG Spokesman on Support for Arms Treaty

LD251647 Moscow TASS in English 1632 GMT 25 Nov 87

[Text] Bonn November 25 TASS—The Soviet-American treaty on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles, to be signed in Washington early in December, is a historical breakthrough in the cause of disarmament and arms control. A press conference here today was told by the official spokesman of the FRG Government Friedhelm Ost. The FRG Government, he stressed, believes that the conclusion of this treaty will serve the attainment of stability on the European Continent.

In his turn the West German Foreign Ministry Spokesman Juergen Chrobog said that the Federal Republic hoped that the treaty between the USSR and the United States would be ratified without delay.

'Defense Concepts' Weighed at Bavarian Talks

LD292154 Moscow TASS in English 2118 GMT 29 Nov 87

[Text] Bonn November 29 TASS—TASS correspondent Gennadiy Kulbitskiy reports:

"Armies Without Offensive Weapons. Defensive Concepts are Necessary" was the motto under which an international conference was held in the Bavarian city of Tutzing on Saturday and Sunday.

It was attended by prominent military scientists, officers from the Federal Republic of Germany and a number of other European countries, including the Soviet Union. The participants in the forum regarded the forthcoming signing of a Soviet-U.S. treaty on full elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles as "an important political step towards a nuclear-free Europe and towards the beginning of a process of general and complete disarmament".

It was pointed out at the conference that the new thinking in military strategy matters and a transition to exclusively defensive concepts were of great importance in the cause of achieving stability on the European continent.

Professor P. von Schubert, director of the Bundeswehr school at Neu Biberg near Munich, made a report at the conference, pointing out the mounting criticism in Europe and throughout the world of the "muclear deterrence" concept.

"Such doctrine", he emphasised, "has no right to exist. Today one can feel everywhere the spirit of the new thinking aimed at creating a system of joint security instead of the strategy the aim of which is mutual destruction".

Von Schubert criticised the U.S. dangerous plans aimed at militarising outer space.

France Conducts Nuclear Test 29 Nov

LD301158 Moscow TASS in English 1141 GMT 30 Nov 87

[Text] London November 30 TASS—France conducted on Sunday a nuclear test, the third this month, on the Pacific Mururoa Atoll, the *Reuter* agency quoted a spokesman for the seismological service under the Government of New Zealand as saying. Beginning from 1975 the department has already registered more than 90 French nuclear tests on Mururoa.

Ligachev Departs for French CP Congress

LD301220 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 30 Nov 87

[Text] Today, at the invitation of the French Communist Party [PCF] Central Committee, in order to participate in the 26th PCF Congress, a delegation of the CPSU Central Committee headed by Comrade Ligachev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has left for Paris.

The delegation includes Comrade Patiashvili, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Communist Party of Georgia Central Committee; Comrade Zagladin, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department; and Zatvornitskiy, member of the CPSU Central Committee and team leader of the multiskill team of the MOSSTROY [Moscow State Construction and Installation Trust] No 1 Construction Directorate No 6.

At the airport, the delegation was seen off by Comrade Zaykov, member of the Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and first secretary of Moscow Gorkom; Comrade Suyev, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department; and other responsible officials of the CPSU Central Committee.

Welcomed at Airport

LD301556 Moscow TASS in English 1541 GMT 30 Nov 87

[Text] Paris November 30 TASS—A delegation from the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) arrived in Paris today at the invitation of the Central Committee of the French Communist Party (PCF) to attend the 26th Congress of the PCF.

The delegation is being led by Yegor Ligachev, a member of the Politburo and a secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

It was welcomed at the airport by representatives of the PCF Central Committee and Yakov Ryabov, Soviet ambassador to France.

On behalf of the leadership of the French Communist Party the CPSU delegation was greeted by Gaston Plissonnier, a member of the Political Bureau and a secretary of the PCF Central Committee, Orly Mayor Gaston Viens and Ivry-Seine Mayor Jacques Laloe.

Paris Literature Forum 'Frankly Anti-Soviet'

PM271329 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 25 Nov 87 p 9

[Own correspondent Kirill Privalov dispatch under the rubric "Behind the Scenes of the Event": "You Cannot Hide the Truth"]

[Text] Paris—In the Park Avenue-Central Park Hotel next to the Arc de Triomphe, everything was orderly and dignified: Speeches were being delivered, the presidium was in session, and press conferences were being organized.... At first sight, the theme of this meeting predisposed one to philosophical thoughts—"Literature Without Borders."

Le Figaro gave lavish publicity to the debates near the Arc de Triomphe—"120 artists, writers, and historians of international repute will discuss the problem of the relation between literature and authority." I glanced through the list of participants. Alongside well-known cultural figures were people who have nothing to do with culture but who have become renowned in the field of anti-Sovietism. However, it is not worth paying attention to official rolls. At this conference, to put it mildly, they did not quite match up to reality. For instance, the Nobel Prize winners for literature, Czeslaw Milosz and Iosif Brodskiy, named as being among the participants, have not come to Paris. On the other hand, Vladimir Maksimov and Vladimir Bukovskiy were sitting on the presidium as if they owned the place. "Opposition International," which they head, is the main organizer of this colloquium.

...There is a brisk trade in books. The choice of subject matter is simple: *Marxism. Totalitarian Temptation, The Soviets and Despotism*, and, of course, *The French in the Gulag*.... And what are the subjects of the reports from the rostrum? "The Peace Movement as a Soviet Tool for Undermining Western Defense," "The Resistance Movement Against Totalitarian Regimes in Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia," "Persecution of Jewish Culture in the USSR".... Glasnost and restructuring did not escape attention: "Glasnost or Camouflage?" "How Far Can We Trust the Changes in the Soviet Union?"....

Stop, stop! This is too much like the article "Let Gorbachev Give Us Some Proof." *Le Figaro* printed a letter from the elite of the "Resistance International" this March under this headline. There is nothing surprising in this—the same handwriting, the same accent. True, the letter did not cause any sensation then—Western propaganda ballyhoo merely proved to be a damp squib. With such a bad hand, it only remained for the "Resistance International" to trust in the high reputation of the Hotel Park Avenue-Central Park and the prestige of the International Pen Club. However sad this may be, it was behind this impressive writers' organization that the "Resistance workers" decided to conceal themselves this time, not to mention Claude Malhuret's "high patronage." He is the French Prime Minister's secretary for human rights, and it is not the first time that he has patronized frankly anti-Soviet actions. Was it not Mr Malhuret's idea to call this meeting the "Paris forum"? As Vladimir Maksimov admitted at the press conference, this was to spite the Moscow peace forum that took place successfully in February.

Incidentally, a word about the press conference which began the alternative "forum." It had a frankly anti-Soviet character. What about the talk of literature which we were promised on the eve of the meeting?

Moreover, the "resistance workers" have decided to make good the shortage of literary problems for discussion with the presence in their presidium of Eugene Ionesco and Rene Tavernier and with noisy self-advertisement: They say that they sent an appropriate invitation "direct to Moscow." But neither the Union of Writers nor any Soviet writer has received any invitation. This, incidentally, has been reported by *L'Humanite*, AFP, and *Reuter*.

No, the "Resistance International" has not managed to conceal its true aims. You cannot hide the truth when it hits you in the face.

AUCCTU Delegation Attends Italian Seminar
PM241457 Moscow TRUD in Russian 24 Nov 87 p 3

[Unattributed report: "Delegation Departs"]

[Text] A Soviet trade union delegation headed by K. Turysov, secretary of the AUCCTU, flew to Rome 22 November to participate in a bilateral scientific practical seminar on the subject of "Training, Retraining, and Improving the Qualifications of Cadres Under the Conditions of Scientific and Technical Progress" at the invitation of the Italian General Confederation of Labor.

Italian CP Meeting Endorses Report on Reforms
LD281934 Moscow TASS in English 1812 GMT 28 Nov 87

[Text] Rome November 28 TASS—The current plenary meeting of the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission of the Italian Communist Party (PCI) endorsed by a majority of votes here today a report by Achille Occhetto, deputy general secretary of the PCI.

A resolution adopted at the plenum expresses consent with the analysis, set out in the report, of the policy of a democratic alternative.

The policy is to unite all progressive forces on the basis of a program for the renewal of society and is the answer to the crisis of the Italian political system, the resolution says.

The PCI Central Committee and the Central Control Commission draw special attention to the need for reforms which would make it possible to overcome the politico-constitutional crisis which becomes aggravated and to begin an in-depth renewal of the country's democratic system, the resolution points out.

Portugal's Soares Continues Visit

Departs Moscow for Yerevan
PM271355 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Nov 87 Morning Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Tour of Country"]

[Text] On 26 November President M. Soares of Portugal, who is paying an official visit to the USSR at the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium's invitation, left Moscow for Yerevan.

M. Soares and his wife were seen off on the tarmac at Vnukovo airport by A.A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and his wife, and P.N. Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Also taking part in the sendoff ceremony were B.L. Tolstykh, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; T.N. Menteshashvili, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; V.M. Velichko and Yu.M. Volmer, ministers of the USSR; V.G. Komplektov, USSR deputy foreign minister; and other officials.

The state flags of Portugal and the USSR and greetings banners were raised at the airport and an honor guard formed from representatives of the three branches of the USSR Armed Forces—the Ground Forces, the Air Force, and the Navy—was mounted on the airfield. A band played the two countries' national anthems.

A.A. Gromyko and M. Soares reviewed the formation of Soviet servicemen.

The departure ceremony ended with a march past by the honor guard.

The Portuguese and Soviet state flags were raised in the streets and squares of the capital along the route to the airport taken by the motorcade accompanied by an honorary motorcycle escort.

The President is being accompanied on his tour of the country by A.A. Mokanu, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; V.P. Kasatkin, USSR ambassador to Portugal; S. de Sacadura Cabral, Portuguese ambassador to the USSR; and other officials.

On the same day M. Soares arrived in Yerevan together with his official escort.

The president of Portugal was greeted at the airport by G.M. Voskanyan, chairman of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and other officials.

Tours Oil Installation
LD292246 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 29 Nov 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Today Mario Soares, the president of Portugal, continued to get to know Baku.

[Begin recording] [Mamedov] Mario Soares, the president of Portugal, today had the rare opportunity of crossing the sea in a car. He was visiting the workers of the Serebrovskiy Marine Oil and Gas Recovery Directorate. For more than 400 km, overpasses extend over the surface of the Caspian. Today two-thirds of all of Azerbaijan's oil is recovered from the sea. The VIP showed an interest in the prospects for the recovery of oil and gas at sea. What we have seen today is grandiose, said Mario Soares. [end recording]

Makes Stopover in Kiev

LD291810 Moscow TASS in English 1802 GMT 29 Nov 87

[Text] Baku November 29 TASS—The official visit to the Soviet Union by President Mario Soares of Portugal came to a close today. He stayed in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

On his way home the head of the Portuguese state made a brief stopover in Kiev.

Departs for Lisbon 30 Nov

LD300620 Moscow TASS in English 0532 GMT 30 Nov 87

[Text] Lisbon November 30 TASS—President Mario Soares of Portugal today returned to Lisbon following the official visit to the Soviet Union.

In an interview with Portugal television before flying from the Soviet Union, Soares has expressed satisfaction with the outcome of talks with Soviet leaders, especially noting the importance of his talk with the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev.

The president underscored the importance of sweeping changes now occurring in the USSR. He declared in support of the upcoming meeting between Gorbachev and U.S. President Reagan and also the planned signing of a Soviet-U.S. treaty on eliminating medium-range and shorter-range missiles.

Visit to CP of the Peoples of Spain

PM240931 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Nov 87 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading "Interparty Ties"]

[Text] At the invitation of the leadership of the Communist Party of the Peoples of Spain, a CPSU delegation headed by I.I. Gladkiy, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems, left for Madrid on 20 November to take part in events on the theme of the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

Delegation Departs Madrid

LD281819 Moscow TASS in English 1522 GMT 28 Nov 87

[Text] Madrid November 28 TASS—A CPSU delegation headed by I.I. Gladkiy, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Labour and Social Questions, left Madrid for Moscow today.

At the invitation of the leadership of the Communist Party of the Peoples of Spain it attended functions devoted to the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

Joint Venture Agreement With Switzerland

LD250109 Moscow TASS in English 1714 GMT 24 Nov 87

[Text] Moscow November 24 TASS—TASS correspondent Yuriy Maksimov reports:

The first joint venture in the history of business relations between Switzerland and the USSR, the chemical enterprise Tauria stands good chances of success. This was said by Rolf Schweizer, president of the Basel firm Sandoz A.G. He signed in Moscow on Monday an agreement on setting up a Soviet-Swiss enterprise for producing dyes in the USSR. The enterprise was formed by the all-union industrial amalgamation "Soyuzanilprom" and the Swiss firm Sandoz A.G.

"I am optimistic about Tauria for the following reasons", R. Schweizer told the TASS correspondent. "First of all, production of dyes will be based on an absolutely new technology. Besides that, the need for these products is large. Hence, its production is promising: We shall be able to constantly increase the volume of export. It is very important that there exist a balance of interests of both partners. Finally, the enterprise ensures both economic and technological progress."

"In case of successful development of bilateral cooperation, we propose to create new kinds of production activity, naturally with mutual consent, around the basic enterprise. The production of dyes is meant first of all," the president said.

Rolf Schweizer did not preclude the possibility of organizing a joint research unit together with Soviet specialists. Besides that, he expressed a readiness to discuss the question of the possibility of further expanding cooperation in production, besides dyes, of other chemicals, for example, printing ink.

"All this gives us grounds to be optimistic about the activity of the joint venture," the Swiss businessman said. "We shall do our utmost to promote its further development," Rolf Schweizer added.

Netherlands Official Welcomes INF Treaty

LD272344 Moscow TASS in English 2026 GMT 27 Nov 87

[Text] The Hague November 27 TASS—Dutch Foreign Minister Hans van den Broek described the Soviet-American understanding on elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles as a "historic landmark and the breakthrough in arms control". He said that preparatory work on deploying 48 U.S. cruises at the Air Force Base Woensdrecht would be stopped right after the signing of the agreement.

Finnish Social Democrats Mark Great October

PM231559 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Nov 87 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Jubilee Events"]

[Text] Helsinki, 17 Nov—Jubilee events organized by the Social Democrat Party of Finland [SSDP] marking the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the 70th anniversary of Finland's independence have been held here.

A seminar involving CPSU representatives was held, at which there was discussion of the role played by collaboration between the workers movements of Russia and Finland in Finland's obtaining state independence, and the problems of cooperation between Communists and Social Democrats in solving urgent tasks of the present day in light of the dialogue held at the Meeting of Representatives of Parties and Movements in Moscow on 4-5 November this year.

A public ceremonial meeting held in the parliament building was addressed by Kalevi Sorsa, member of the SSDP Executive Committee and Finnish foreign minister. He stressed the friendly, fiducial nature of Soviet-Finnish relations.

Dwelling on the tasks of consolidating security and cooperation in northern Europe, the minister pointed to the prospects being opened up in this regard by the proposals put forward by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Commmittee, in his Murmansk speech.

K. Sorsa welcomed the upcoming Soviet-American agreement on eliminating a whole class of nuclear arms and pointed to the pressing need to make rapid progress in reducing strategic offensive arms.

A greetings message on behalf of the CPSU was delivered to the meeting by Yu.A. Krasin, head of the CPSU Central Commitee Social Sciences Institute. He said he was certain that a new level of united action by the workers movement is essential today, when the international workers movement is faced with complex tasks connected with ensuring mankind's survival, its conditions of existence, and a life for people that is in keeping with the scientific, technical, and cultural achievements of modern civilization, and when the problems of maintaining and expanding the socioeconomic and democratic rights of working people are acute.

In the speeches made during the jubilee events, SSDP leaders advocated continuing and developing constructive dialogue between the two main currents in the international workers movement—Communists and Social Democrats— and also expanding it in the area of social progress.

Finnish Communists Celebrate

PM271047 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Nov 87 First Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "In Honor of the October Anniversary"]

[Text] Helsinki, 23 Nov—Finnish Communists have held festive events here devoted to the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the 70th anniversary of Finland's state independence.

Addressing a festive meeting organized by the Finnish Communist Party, Party Chairman A. Aalto declared that the October Revolution and the attainment of independence by Finland are closely interconnected historically. The experience of the post-October decades, he pointed out, has convincingly proved socialism's mighty strength.

A jubilee session of a Finnish Communist Party (Unity) Central Committee Plenum was addressed by Party Chairman T. Sinisalo, who pointed to the vitality and topicality of Great October's ideas and their growing influence in the world. He hailed the restructuring being carried out in the Soviet Union, pointing out that it is striking against the hostile ideas which right-wing forces create about the USSR.

The speakers who addressed the Finnish Communists' festive events emphasized the consistently peace-loving nature of the USSR's foreign policy course.

Latin America & Caribbean

Chilean Communist Party Political Report

PY231755 Moscow in Spanish to Chile 2130 GMT 18-21 Nov 87

[Political report submitted during the plenary session of the Central Committee of the Chilean Communist Party held in October in Chile; broadcast in four installments on 18-21 November]

[Text] The report says:

Dear comrades: In the previous plenary session, which was held in January 1985, we analyzed the possibility of ousting the dictatorship through a mass upheaval. This possibility is still valid. At the end of 1985, we concluded that there was a possibility of terminating the dictatorship during 1986, provided all of us decided to adopt a combative attitude. We expressly stated this in a Central Committee manifesto. The Coordinating Board of the Left, the Socialist bloc, and the Democratic Alliance agreed to this approach.

Major mass struggles took place during the first half of 1986. The Civic Assembly was created by the more representative organizations of workers, neighbors, peasants, Mapuche people, students, women, professionals, intellectuals, university professors, writers, artists, businessmen, and transportation sector workers. The Private Political Committee of the opposition party has regularly supported the Civic Assembly. This process peaked with the great national strike of 2 and 3 July, which was a combative and broad stoppage. The opposition had virtually agreed to call for new and increasingly frequent strikes until the dictatorship was ousted.

The report goes on to say that, under imperialist pressure, one sector of the opposition abandoned the path of social mobilization and political accord. There was fear that the movement of the masses could grow and thus lead to the violent end of the dictatorship, giving rise to a situation in which the people would play a key role. In addition, the anticommunist offensive was intensified in the wake of the arsenals case and the attempt on the tyrant's life. Consequently, some of the centrist parties, together with some leftist parties, retreated. The bourgeois opposition shamefully surrendered to the Pinochet regime. Under those circumstances, we were unable to lead the movement to its expected end because we had to compensate for the desertion of the bourgeois opposition sectors.

It is therefore a fact that the political sectors had changed their mind by mid-1986. The Christian Democratic Party and other sectors began a shift toward the right, stressing that their position was different from that of the leftist opposition and refusing to agree to a consensus among the anti-dictatorship forces. Another consequence was that they relinquished positions they had previously supported, such as to render the country ungovernable and to promote civil disobedience. This position has given considerable relief to Pinochet and has weakened and further divided the opposition.

It is also true that now the mobilization has been considerably intensified, as is shown by the conflict at the University of Chile, where the designated rector, and the one who designated him against the will of the nation, that is, the dictator himself, were challenged for 2 months. This conflict has caused the most serious crisis the regime has experienced in the area of higher education during these 14 years.

The 7 October general strike showed that the workers and the labor sector support intensification of the struggle. The strike was successful, thus confirming the accuracy of the strategy of struggle and accord. In several ways, workers expressed their rejection of the regime through a stoppage that became almost total at noon, and which turned into a great combative protest in many sectors in Santiago and in other cities. It was a massive, legitimate demonstration, in which workers supported not only their demands and rights but also democracy and freedom. The labor organizations have publicly stated that they have decided to call for new strikes to support their demands and the people's demands, to which the dictatorship has turned a deaf ear.

The struggles in 1986, and the ones that took place in recent months, show that the only way of moving forward toward democracy is to resolutely confront the dictatorship, leading to a collapse of the fascist system and to total elimination of the regime. This consistent and realistic attitude is the foundation of our policy of popular rebellion by the masses, whose name indicates its major components. This policy is imbued with a firm determination to promote actions aimed at breaking the institutional system, adopting various forms of struggle to successfully face repression, and to promote a mass upheaval against the dictatorship.

The plenary session of the Central Committee has a precise objective: to enforce our policy of popular rebellion by the masses, which has been formulated and enriched by all the analysis and documental evidence the party has produced since 1980, especially in the 1985 plenary session. We must redouble our efforts to expand and intensify social mobilizations, resorting to the people's combative capacity, in order to defeat the plans of the oligarchy and of imperialism, which support continuation of the fascist regime, with or without Pinochet.

We will never awaken false expectations. Pinochet will not agree to call free elections. He will engage in frauds. Therefore, we Communists have reiterated—and will tirelessly continue to reiterate—that the first thing to do is to promote the broadest combative capacity of the masses, the objective being to terminate the tyranny. This objective will be achieved only through a general struggle by the people, through effective forms of resistance, and through actions of all kinds aimed at creating a situation in which the country will be ungovernable and in which civil disobedience and a mass upheaval will be promoted, thus breaking the fascist institutional system. This will create necessary conditions for restoring democracy and freedom with the active participation of all interested sectors. In this way, what the Communists have called popular rebellion of the masses can be implemented, leading to the most likely possibility, that is, a national insurrection or a democratic upheaval.

The upheaval can take different forms, like the general upheavals in the Philippines and Haiti, and in Chile in 1931, when the entire people took to the streets, instigating the then military dictator's downfall.

The Communist Party has always advocated free elections. The plebiscite called for 1989 will be neither a plebiscite nor a free event, as Pinochet himself has stressed by saying that it will be a consultation on his regime. His real objective is to become dictator for life.

In the 1980 plebiscite, the tyrant imposed a constitution that suits his ambitions, the ambitions of the multinationals, and the greed of the old and new oligarchy. The result of that plebiscite was preestablished by the tyrant months before it was held. That fraud was a dirty farce in which the people were not allowed any type of control, either on the voting or on the vote count. That is the model of plesbicite that the despot wants to repeat now, but on a larger scale.

We are convinced that the best way of terminating Pinochet's dictatorship is by popular rebellion of the masses. Within this process, the struggle for free elections can play a significant role, that is, we see it as part of a general task aimed at destroying the fascist regime. Only if the campaign for free elections actually helps to oust the regime will it be a useful campaign. If the campaign is nothing but an action that operates in keeping with the regime's rules, our duty and our commitment to the cause of the people and to freedom will compel us to continue to criticize it as a campaign that was absolutely useless to terminate the dictatorship.

We must not forget the deep disappointment that the victory announced by Pinochet in his plebiscite farce in 1980 caused to the centrist-rightist opposition. At that time, we said that no one should harbor any hopes. The dictatorship, availing itself of a constitution that restricts freedom, has declared that the constitution cannot be amended. Furthermore, the regime is planning to win its plebiscite at any cost. Pinochet has decided to remain in power for the rest of his life, because he says that this is the mission God has entrusted to him. He continues to stubbornly assemble the machine that will impose his will by hook or by crook.

We reiterate the position that we have always upheld: The first thing is to oust Pinochet. He is the main obstacle that must be removed. The tyrant is an image of his regime. A group of flatterers and people who have misused power, and a sinister terrorist organization have grown around him. The terrorist organization, financed by state funds and headed by the CNI [National Intelligence Center], acts on his personal orders. The ousting of Pinochet is not everything, yet it is a basic precondition for a truly democratic reconstruction. To get him off the political stage forever is a great patriotic objective. It is the starting point for producing a change in the course of the country, in the interest of the majority.

It could be concluded that given the existence of a despotic regime, which attacks all opposition parties, conditions are appropiate for concerted action in many sectors. To try to jointly struggle to put an end to the dictatorship is an essential political goal.

The entire country knows that we have always insisted on this point. We have done everything in our power to remove the obstacles hindering that concerted action.

The main contradiction is presented by those who want to maintain the current system and those who want to replace it. The majority of the country, and the PCCh most of all, want the latter. The outbreak of national repudiation creates problems for the dictatorship because some of its members want continuation of the economic and political system with Pinochet, and others want it without Pinochet. Among the opposition, some sectors want a return to a restricted democracy, while other sectors struggle for a definitive end to the dictatorship and reestablishment of a truly democratic regime.

U.S. imperialism is an important factor, with daily intervention in all spheres of Chilean life. The imperialists intrude either openly or surreptiously in the most diverse aspects of politics, the economy, and Armed Forces, the news media, and the social organizations. The present U.S. ambassador and the frequent U.S. emissaries from the White House, the Pentagon, the Department of State, the CIA, the U.S. multinationals, the IMF, etc. act in Chile without shame. They maintain close relations with the military regime, which they support, even though some sectors in the United States harshly criticize the dictatorship's actions and attitudes. The U.S. agents sharpen their knifes against the PCCh and maintain open relations with opposition parties to reduce rejection of the military regime to the minimum. They repeatedly recommend to the opposition that they engage in dialogue and negotiation with the tyranny. These U.S. agents lay a single condition for their hypothetical support: isolation of the Communists and Marxist sectors, and division of the leftist parties.

They are not really concerned about human rights. They are worried about wearing out Pinochet and whether his continuation in power could affect U.S. interests in Chile. Pinochet continues to be the favorite U.S. trump, and only if his continuation in power became impossible would he be replaced, to let some steam out of the social boiler and ensure continuation of the system with a less hateful face.

People in Washington cannot sleep out of concern for the possible overthrow of the fascist tyranny by the Chilean people and its replacement with an advanced, anti-imperialist, and anti-oligarchical democracy in preparation for introduction of a socialist system.

They are afraid of the deep revolutionary process of change introduced by Allende's government, the strength of the Chilean working class, the presence of a strong left, and the influence and power of our party.

What can we do to mobilze the entire Chilean people and promote understanding of the democratic forces opposing the dictatorship? All those who want to continue the struggle have to join efforts. All those who want to advance must advance. All those who want to work together must unite. The struggle and unity have strong attractions. The offensive should start with alliances at the grassroots. The unity should manifest itself through action. A good example was given by the United Left, the Christian Democratic Party, and Puente Alto's Humanist Party, which on 2 October signed a joint manifesto calling on all industrial workers, municipal workers, [two words indistinct], professors, students, homeowners, shop owners, homeless families, mothers who demand better health care, and the people as a whole to join the struggle against scarcity of basic staples and the high cost of living. A call was also made to families eating at soup kitchens to join the struggle for solutions to their basic needs. The manifesto calls on the population to demand an end to the kidnappings, murders, torture, and the exiles and illegal arrests. For this, the signatories of the document believe it is first necessary to end the state's terrorist dictatorship.

The agreements in other neighborhoods in Santiago on rejection of the plebiscite, satisfaction of popular demands, and demand for free and democratic elections is proof of the immense possibilities of developing joint actions with sectors beyond the left.

The United Left has to be developed and strengthened. The Chilean left of the previous government represents a real alternative, the most progressive and democratic alternative. At the same time, it puts pressure on other democratic sectors for joint action. Maximum emphasis should be laid on mobilization of social organizations. This sector offers the greatest possibilities for the struggle of the masses to pursue their just rights and to put an end to the fascist regime.

The divisionist and exclusive position of the political center slows down and hurts the action of social organizations, but it will not destroy their determination for joint action. These organizations constitute the people's strongest weapon and a place where different democratic sectors meet. This was shown during demonstrations organized by the National Workers Command in Santiago and other cities in August. Workers then gave a correct analysis of the present situation and the future, and proposed an open policy of struggle.

The president of the National Workers Command [CNT], Manuel Bustos, interpreted the masses' feeling by urging the political parties not to fear the people, to have faith in them, and not to believe that letters and agreements signed behind their backs have magical powers. Bustos summoned the 7 October rally demanding bread, work, and respect for the people's rights by stating that the people want freedom and will march for it.

The people have a much more intelligent and clear idea of the current situation than many members of the so-called political class. The modest sectors, the workers, shantytown dwellers, students, women, professors, and intellectuals on a whole have a more clear, realistic, and sensible idea of the current situation than certain political leaders who have spent many years trying to work out how to divide the opposition and thwart mobilization.

The top leaders must learn a lesson from the grassroots. The top leaders must turn to active and jobless workers, to relatives of the dead mine workers, to shantytown dwellers who barely made it through winter with their modest homes flooded by water, to those who barely survive working for the PEN [Minimum Salary Program] and POJH [Employment Program for Heads of Households], to retired workers who receive a miserable pension, to those mortgage holders who cannot pay their debt, to youths who have no future and demand a place under the sun. Yes, they should turn to those who suffer all types of shortcomings and are full of dissatisfaction and rebelliousness. They will have to listen to those who are willing to struggle for a free life worth living. The time has come for the leaderships that are reluctant to accept that a consensus is necessary to acknowledge the appeal made by the united women to seek a common denominator for concrete action.

No better method to win better times has or can be devised than a joint struggle of the entire people. This method has its ups and downs, its ebb and flow, very hard and difficult times, but there is no other alternative than to advance with determination along this path.

This has been proven, among other events, by the impressive mobilization of the professors, employees, and students of the University of Chile in defense of our main higher education institution. Pinochet has decided to destroy this university through the rector he himself appointed: Jose Federici. The fact that the entire university community of Chile voiced its solidarity with the movement, and that it had the support of technical schools, of the CNT, shantytown dwellers, and political and democratic forces, shows that this movement is the crushing expression of an unquestionable national majority sector that not only demands respect and democracy for the university, but also for the entire country.

The movement for the defense of the University of Chile requires the entire country's support. We make an appeal to step up even more the solidarity with this university.

In order to bring about changes, it is necessary to make politics among the masses, to support their claims and demand that they be fulfilled, to acknowledge their needs and their desire for changes through their determination to struggle. It is highly positive to step up direct participation by the publicly known leaders of the United Left—and of the Communists, of course—in the labor union assemblies, shantytowns, universities, and all sectors in which the people struggle for their rights.

We point out the vital need for the current leaders, as well as those comrades who have held representative posts for many years, those who were mass leaders when our party was legally recognized, to become active elements in daily contact with the people. This is necessary to guide, organize, and lead the people's struggle by imposing a new form of making politics and opening the path for legal recognition of our party.

We should mention efforts made in this regard by leaders of the United Left and various social organizations. We insist that more should be done in this field. The public spokesmen and all those who represent the masses should become true leaders, encouraged by a true combative spirit and loyally expressing the anti-fascist and revolutionary stance of our party.

The main characteristic of us Communists is that we never lose hope in the working class and the people. However, we are well aware that they do not become mobilized magically, but rather as a result of the tenacious effort of their most active and outstanding members, once they become aware of their own strength through their actions, once they are summoned for a concrete and attractive objective that has clearly determined prospects. A tenacious effort of thousands and thousands of combatants within the masses and in the right direction can and should yield fruitful results.

We must be inspired by the steadiness, dedication, unselfishness, and discipline shown by relatives of the missing arrested persons, of those executed, of political prisoners who have touched the people with their heroic hunger strikes, and of members of the Sebastian Acevedo Movement Against Torture. We should also be inspired by the example set by the [word indistinct] Mapuche Indians, and the inhabitants of several of the large Santiago districts, as well as the university students who during these past years have struggled in an admirable way for their rights and demands, as well as for the freedom of Chile. Examples of heroism are abundant among the people. The struggle for democracy is not only a right of the political parties. It is the cause of the people and social organizations.

The PCCh and other political forces, with the support of a large part of the people, have tried and will continue trying to define the conflict of democracy against dictatorship as soon as possible, even before 1989. At the same time, we had the obligation to consider different situations.

The way it looks right now, it is possible that the plebiscite will be held in September 1988, or in January 1989 at the latest. There is an urgent need to carry out a broad and intensive campaign with the support of large sectors based on needs of the masses. The campaign should point out the people's claims, and the masses should multiply their forces. An energetic campaign should be conducted, charging that the upcoming plebiscite prepared by Pinochet is a fraud.

Recently we found that for various reasons, and in some cases due to political analyses we definitely do not share, the electoral registration issue has become a new pretext to avoid or weaken the consensus needed to do away with Pinochet's plans to perpetuate the dictatorship through the plebiscite.

The fascist Constitution, the electoral registration law, and the law of political parties were drawn up to become part of the institutional mechanisms of the dictatorship to insure its permanence. They were designed to exclude the left, which is at least a third of the people. They were designed for the registration of two or three parties only; the other parties, even those which are not leftist, would be excluded.

It should also be pointed out that registered parties have the obligation to hand over to the tyranny and its repressive organizations a list of their members and sympathizers. This is equivalent to including their names on a list of people who are potential candidates for persecution. Social leaders are also prohibited from belonging to a political party.

The National Episcopate has announced requirements it believes necessary in order for the people to express themselves legitimately through the vote, such as participation by a large number of voters, changes to the mechanisms of presidential successsion, and changes in the Constitution, including permanent Article 8 and provisional Article 24. Although we believe these requirements are not enough, we also believe they are positive. The charges made by various centrist parties against the Pinochet candidacy, his electoral campaign, Article 8, the presidential succession, and the stubbornness of the tyrant in impossing the plebiscite at any cost are also positive.

Our party said through a bulletin published in *El Siglo* in May 1987 that we do not advocate electoral registration within the framework of the government system, that electoral registration is not the most important issue in the struggle between the people and the tyranny, and that we respect individual decisions made in this regard.

When we made that statement, we kept in mind the anti-democratic nature of the system established by the fascist Constitution, the law of political parties, and the electoral law. The system, in addition to proscribing political parties, also establishes a tutelage of the Armed Forces over the public powers. It also grants Pinochet the right to elect one-third of the Senate and to appoint the commanders of the Armed Forces and the general director of Carabineros for 8 years. The system does not allow any amendments of the Constitution until the end of this century and establishes mechanisms to create a restrictive electoral body without the presence of the poor population, who are discouraged from registration not only by a slow registration procedure conducted by clerks writing longhand, but also by the relatively high cost of registration.

Our decision not to promote electoral registration kept in mind that the Pinochet Constitution denies the Communists and Marxists their political rights, and that electoral law can eliminate them from electoral registries. Our decision against it was also aimed at stopping a tendency aimed at replacing social mobilization against the dictatorship with a campaign in support of free elections that was designed without regard for the struggle for the demands of the poor sectors.

Our position was well accepted by the masses. We are certain that had the opposition political parties rejected electoral registration, we would have defeated the dictatorship. That was the best position, but it was disregarded by practically all the political parties.

The refusal of the PCCh to ask its members and followers to register at the electoral offices is in answer to the need to stress before the public that it is a very risky proposition. Participation in Pinochet's plebiscite simply for the sake of participating, while dropping the most important duty of promoting social mobilization in all fields, is a dangerous tendency.

This is the reason we feel a need to stress to the people not to expect too much from the rigged plebiscite and not to abandon the path that leads to tyranny's end—the path of struggle.

We have seen a lot of speculation and an excess of mistaken interpretations of the Communist position regarding electoral registration. We want to stress that electoral registration has no strategic value because it will not decide the conflict between tyranny and democracy by itself. It represents a basically tactical element that can be inserted when useful and at the proper time in a framework of a broader program of action drawn up to reach the strategic goal: the end of the de facto regime.

We have gathered the opinions of several sectors of members and party organizations on this point, always in agreement with the democratic principles of our party. There is basic agreement among all sectors that it is absurd to launch a campaign for free elections without an all-out struggle to end the dictatorship first. We all agree that this fight must come first. Registration by itself does not solve anything. The only thing capable of changing the situation is struggle, and we do not admit that we have to postpone it until 1989.

We have to start the struggle today. We have to struggle every day. We have to get ready for any contingency. We have to fully capture the spirit of unrest and rebellion, and the hope of the masses to change the present state of affairs, through a continuous struggle in order to achieve total uprising of the people. This will hopefully come about soon. The last months have been months of constant combat. The few remaining weeks of the year will surely witness new battles of the people. It is quite possible that incidents of mass protesting in the streets will multiply in 1988, to show their feelings and to end the 14-year nightmare. We will do everything possible to march together with the United Left and with anyone sharing the same ideals. We will march at the head of a people which for a long time has been saying enough to the crimes of the dictatorship and to the bourgeois opposition's indecision and complicity. We do not want to waste time discussing electoral registration. We oppose it because it distracts people from the need for answers; it thwarts their desire to struggle.

We refuse to participate in an electoral festival.

We have to accept that controversy among opposition forces regarding this issue has even reached the United Left. But their differences are only superficial. These differences, however, have been used hysterically by the oligarchy and the dictatorship through their mass communication media network. Those who do not want an understanding use the issue of internal disunity in a hypocritical and extensive way. It is also used by the eternal enemies of a general consensus.

The centrist and right-wing parties have taken the issue of electoral registration into the midst of the social organizations, trying to make it a key element in the people's struggle. This discussion has been overcome by mobilization, despite some people's efforts to revive it in order to obstruct the process of unifying the opposition.

The Political Commission submits to the Central Committee the re-examination of the issue to strengthen our policy of popular rebellion of the masses, to give more emphasis to confrontation with the dictatorship, and to express even louder denunciation of the fraudulent plebiscite that has been arranged, and of the undemocratic and anti-popular nature of the electoral registration system.

The Political Comission proposes to the plenum that the Central Committee issue a communique accepting electoral registration.

The main difference among opposition forces is not expressed by their position regarding electoral registration, but by their willingness to struggle against the fascist regime.

Our proposal of a resolution to register at the electoral offices does not solve by itself the difficulties in achieving unity among Chilean opposition sectors, but it is a step toward that goal. With this resolution we destroy the pretext some people have against joint action. We will uncover those that persist with that pretext. This resolution will allow us to overcome differences within the United Left, giving it more cohesion and increasing its political and organizational capacity as a promoter of the people's participation in the battle against tyranny. It will also allow the United Left to obtain a broader political consensus and to include at least the most progressive sectors, even if the parties of the center do not join in.

In sum, our proposal will contribute to development of a movement able to confront the dictatorship on all fronts. The electoral registration should then be considered as just another event among others that are more importent and decisive.

We submit this proposition because we are sure it will constitute a timely and necessary application of party policy in today's very complex situation.

We thus answer the present situation's requirement and make progress in our overall policy. All this has come about as a result of a process of consultations and analysis within our organization. We do not impose things by decree in our party. It is a process of becoming conscious of our needs and of collective and individual convictions.

We have to make it very clear that even though our determination will increase the size of the electorate, it will not change something beyond our will: the fact that millions of Chileans will not be able to register because of insurmountable material requirements. Automated registration is an increasing need to which the dictatorship will never respond.

Regarding the Communist Party, some people have prepared charges against whatever position it takes. Some people say the Communists will be to blame if Pinochet wins the plebiscite, but the Communist Party will have nothing to do with the results if Pinochet loses the plebiscite. The fallacies of the professional anti-communists will not determine our conduct. This conduct will be determined by our principles and the correct apreciation of reality.

We also reaffirm the statement made last July by the PCCh Political Commission that says: We advocate a united movement of the masses willing to retake the path of mobilization and decisive struggle, to break the dictatorship's plans, to work against the plebiscite, to propose free and democratic elections for president now, to have a congress with constituent powers, and to have automated electoral registries under democratic control. Equal political rights for all political parties would give the struggle for free elections a new quality. Within that framework, it would be possible for all democrats to reach agreements and commitments.

We now propose an agreement with all opposition forces to face the plebiscite with a single purpose and to denounce and reject the great fraud being prepared by the dictatorship. It should be kept in mind that whatever the result of the plebiscite, the Pinochet Constitution will still prevail and Pinochet will continue to be the boss, sitting on the throne or behind it. This situation will only be avoided if we all act with a common purpose before, during, and after the plebiscite.

We must prepare the people's and the country's answer to imposition of the plebiscite, keeping in mind that the struggle of the masses can create appropriate conditions for a national upheaval. The joint struggle can even lead to results before the plebiscite, and this is why it is necessary to define an urgent common plan.

We should also realize that whatever the result of the plebiscite, there will be a social conflict that can only be resolved through institutional rupture, in other words, disregarding the 1980 Constitution and creating some kind of democratic regime outside that Constitution.

That will only be achieved through pressure and mobilization of the masses. We must make an effort to transform the mobilization into a democratic upheaval, into some kind of national revolution, as was proposed at the 1985 PCCh plenum.

We are holding this plenary session on the eve of the 70th anniversary of the Socialist Revolution of October. As a consequence, we propose to send a message of friendship and congratulations to the CPSU, with which we have marched together since the day Luis Emilio Recabarren founded our party.

It is fascinating to witness how the renewal process, the new upsurge of revolutionary democracy, takes place in Lenin's country under the CPSU's leadership. Its objective is to develop all forms of direct democracy, to get the masses to participate in various sectors, to establish political openness. It is also interesting to see how the economic reorganization process takes place, how criticism and self-criticism is exercised, how information becomes a tool of the public opinion. This also allows improvement of the social, political, and private rights of the people as well as broadening of liberties. The USSR today is taking great steps forward not only with the purpose of attaining an economic democracy in which the right to a job, housing, health, education, culture, recreation are guaranteed, but also to have a country that is marching toward full democracy and freedom.

The 70th anniversary of the October Revolution is celebrated at a time when international public opinion considers development of a new phase of the USSR peace policy as one of the most outstanding events of the 20th century. This policy currently consists of the proposals made by Mikhail Gorbachev to save mankind from a nuclear holocaust and the arms race. A large part of the world regards Gorbachev as the spokesman for mankind's greatest hope: a world free of wars that will guarantee survival of the human race.

The recent visit that Erich Honecker, secretary general of the GDR Socialist Unity Party and chairman of the GDR Council of State, paid to the FRG represents an important demonstration of the peaceful policy promoted by socialism. The place that the GDR deserves to occupy in the world arena, which the FRG revanchists and fascism supporters have tried to ignore for years, has finally been recognized universally.

The international revolutionary movement, the USSR, socialist countries, and nonaligned countries represent the most dynamic element of the present time, and they are experiencing deep-rooted changes. We believe we must learn a lesson from these changes, not in a mechanical way but rather adapted to our own real situation. We must also incorporate these changes, fight inertia, encourage initiative, promote open discussions—criticizism and self- criticism—especially within our party ranks-and-files. However, we must never stray from the method of finding out whether our policy is feasible. We must always be on the lookout for new phenomena within society, the social classes, especially within the working class and the people. We must sharpen our feeling for new tendencies that develop within the youth sectors. In other words, our party today must be a party that is aware that we are at the end of the 20th century, and it must get ready to confront the 21st century by promoting, under new circumstances, the teachings of liberty and democracy for socialism.

Latin America today is no longer what it used to be some decades ago. Not only the people but also the governments of the region demand peace in Central America and an end to U.S. intervention in Nicaragua. This, too, is Chile's cause.

The PCCh also raises the banner of solidarity with Sandino's country. This banner had already been raised by Gabriela Mistral [Chilean poetess] during Sandino's struggle.

The PCCh plenary session also coincides with the 20th anniversary of the death of Che Guevara, hero of Sierra Maestra and the great battle for social liberation of the Latin American countries, comrade of Fidel Castro, leader of the first successful Latin American socialist revolution. Che Guevara's life is an example of audacity, courage, unselfishness, achievements, and international solidarity. Today, as always, his personality, which has become legendary, is a prototype that inspires the action of many revolutionary persons.

The PCCh wishes the best for the people and the country. It strongly desires a quick end to the fascist dictatorship and triumph of the democratic cause. The PCCh is certain this will be the case, and that the possibility of prompt success depends on what all of us democrats do today. Final victory will depend on our eagerness in combat.

We reiterate to all active PCCh members and Communist youth organizations, to all our sympathizers, and to the Chilean people our unwavering desire to contribute with all our energy to free Chile from the fascist nightmare.

We reiterate our deepest conviction that only struggle and joint action by all sectors will regain respect in our country for the right to life, work, a piece of bread, and human dignity.

With the reason and force as allies we will triumph.

Political & Social

Vasilyev Sees 'Bonapartism' in Leaders

PM151936 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 15 Nov 87 Second Edition p 3

[Ivan Vasilyev article: "'Bonapartists' and Democracy"— boldface as published]

[Text] October 1987—In the attempt to understand the braking mechanism in the grass-roots components, in my previous article ("Staying on the Sidelines" ["Postoronnost"], 4 October 1987) [published in the 16 November Soviet Union *Daily Report*, page 49] I wrote about management offices, economic leaders, and their group interests, but I did not touch on character. The experience of democratization of management that we have accumulated in 2 and 1/2 years shows that when people have to assess their leader, they consider first and foremost what kind of character their chief is, and only then do they look at his practical qualities. This is a very important detail that cadre departments scarcely take into consideration. Not because they do not want to, but because the "armchair" selection system does not and cannot take account of a person's character, there is no such section in the questionnaire. True, a character reference is attached, but, first, it is composed by the bosses, and, second, it again primarily assesses practical qualities. But when people started choosing their own chief, they looked first and foremost at that aspect of the person with which they have direct, daily contact, on which the mood of every subordinate depends, and which, more than other conditions, shapes their feelings and consciousness—they took a look at him and assessed him: cruel or kind, rude or polite, arrogant or generous, callous or sympathetic, mendacious or truthful, unscrupulous or conscientious, true to his word or an idle talker, in general they assessed him, as the saying goes, by his human qualities.

So what has the experience we have accumulated revealed? What kind of characters are our leadership cadres? It would doubtless take a major study to answer this. But it must be tried, and, regrettably, few such attempts have yet been made. Let us hope that the forthcoming discussions at all levels of the results of the first stage of the restructuring will produce much that is of value in this respect. In my own analysis I will attempt to examine **one** character or, if you like, one **characteristic—lust for power** [vlastolyubiye]. How is this trait manifested in a person, how and in what direction does it develop, what feeds it, what consequences does it lead to, and what will become of it subsequently in the conditions of democracy? The examples I cited in my previous article and other similar examples reveal first and foremost the desire for **sole power** [yedinovlastiye], the wish to command people—that "Bonapartism" that is commonly called **self-will**. Emphasis on the individual in economic and social life, on his paramount role in any matter, could not but lead—and did!—to the belittling of the masses' role. The administrative and bureaucratic apparatus, through numerous restrictions on autonomy, assigned to the masses, to the workers' collectives and individual citizens, the role of passive fulfiller of instructions, and that was the soil in which the "Bonapartists" successfully began to grow.

Somewhere around the end of the sixties and beginning of the seventies there was a sharp acceleration in the process of renewal of cadres, the veterans who had invaluable experience of organizing the masses in the war and postwar years retired, and they were replaced by VUZ-educated young people, specialists and technologists, who gave themselves the special label "practical men" and "technocrats," elevated machinery and technology to the status of idols, and left man with the role of "a factor in production," included on the very last line of the list of "elements of the equation."

I remember very well how the behavior of the young technocrats, smacking strongly of arrogance, grated on us old men. That was when the stock phrases became current: "no problem," "the matter is settled," "it will be done," "no question," uttered in a tone of the utmost authority, confidently and peremptorily. It was curious to see how they "made themselves." How they developed the image: the style of behavior, manners, mien, voice of a "practical man." It was—and I say it with respect!—self-education. Persistent and... And pleasing, dammit! On the face of it, they looked beyond reproach, so it was no crime to envy them. They refrained from loud, humiliating reprimands and scoldings, they tried to be polite, they dressed for work as if for a holiday: clean shirts and ties, gleaming shoes, leather jackets and coats, and deerskin hats. They were unfussed and steady, they conducted themselves with dignity, among themselves they did not stand on ceremony but showed just a touch of familiarity, they understood the merest hint. All this made them stand out clearly against the background of the old guard, and the more of them there were and the more persistently they educated themselves, the more often we old men found ourselves wondering: Whom are they modeling themselves on? Today I come to the sorrowful conclusion that we failed to appreciate what kind of moral ideal they had set out to imitate. There was too much egotism in it.

This new wave of cadres, the so-called generation of "practical men," began actively to reevaluate social ideals and moral norms. Their egotism high-handedly rearranged moral priorities: conscience, decency, kindness, compassion, a sense of civic duty were pushed into the background, while convenience and pleasure came to the fore and became a cult. They replaced the citizen's word of honor with the pledge of caste loyalty, you could let down anyone except each other. Egotism inevitably would and did generate cronyism and favoritism, and they in turn led to low exactingness. You only have to start the chain, and it will carry on of its own accord. Low exactingness led to the dynastic system, whereby artists' children begame artists, actors' children became actors, and bosses' children became bosses, that is, selection was based not on abilities, but on the parents' official prestige, and the standard of art, management, and whatever else it might be was forced willy-nilly to adapt to the mediocre abilities of the heirs of the dynasties—a lowering of the quality of all our work began, along with a simultaneous growth in ambition. "Bonapartism," like any social phenomenon, once born, began to reproduce itself, reinforcing egotism and arrogance in the new generations and pushing conscience into the background.

Strange as it may seem, society played into their hands. The new caste drew apart, partitioned itself off behind social barriers, and received more and more privileges, while in the public consciousness, instead of hostility and antagonism, there developed a desire to follow in the wake of the "select few," to adapt and accommodate oneself, and to gain at least some benefits from proximity and servility. Around every "Bonapartist" a kind of **magnetic field** developed, which was the breeding ground for the egotism of the one and a zone of moral degeneration of the many. These zones spread both vertically, from top to bottom, and horizontally, sideways, permeating all strata of society like secondary cancers. Thus the social base for egotism grew up, giving rise to a double alliance: on the one hand, among "Bonapartists" of all ranks, and on the other, between the "Bonapartist" and his servile entourage. These two alliances became a wall against the new wind of restructuring, a blank wall, an impenetrable and at the same time flexible, camouflaging defense.

The restructuring proclaimed the reappraisal of the values we had lived by for decades, including a review of our views on the leader, on the role of the leader and the mass. According to my observations, the post-April time is characterized precisely by resistance to this reappraisal. If we had been told, as used to happen before: Let us turn a little to the left or a little to the right, then we would have carried out orders, sometimes harmoniously and sometimes not, and without it affecting ourselves, without reassessing ourselves, we would have carried on, and what might come of it was the least important thing. But this time it was a reappraisal that was required.

But this too was initially interpreted as criticism in general, as the open enumeration of general negative phenomena, and therefore it was taken up with enthusiasm, to general acclaim, as the saying goes, because it did not yet affect us personally. But the process deepened and, according to the law of healing, it became internal, that is, it required literally every one of us to reappraise himself. That moment was recorded in the press, and if you look through the newspaper files from about a year ago, you hear the voices of those who are "without sin": Do I need to restructure myself, they say, if I was already one of the "righteous"? You can feel it: This affects me personally. It had sunk in, so to speak: Without changing people, we will not change life, everything will stay the same. But "the old way" is impossible, it leads nowhere, there is an impasse ahead, a crisis, a shock, and the more clearly the danger was perceived, the more strongly conscience inquired: "And you, honest and decent as you are, you who withstood the temptation of unearned benefits, who never went against your conscience, you who are unsullied and pure, who have never told a word of a lie and never acted falsely, can you remain the way you were? Is not the yardstick by which you measure your past virtues too short? The scale of values has been raised to a height where idols crumble and merits fade, so pluck up your courage and measure yourself against that scale." This question faced everyone more or less peremptorily, and this was a new stage in the restructuring process—the "human factor" was coming into play. The time had come to talk of characters.

Reappraisal is not easy for any character type, but it is particularly hard on the autocratic [samovlastnyy] character. First and foremost because he is not capable of enterprising, constructive activity, but only knows how to expose excesses, correct wild ideas, check those who get out of line, and pursue a policy, and this ardor for rectification, which got him promoted to posts on the party schedule, is something that it is almost impossible for him to suppress himself. Experience gained in the countryside provides plenty of confirmations of this. And it may, perhaps, be noted, without fear of going too far: Not one "autocrat" chairman (director) has made his farm an exemplary farm, and all the exemplary farms were created by great democrats and talented organizers and educators.

When we admire the phenomenon whereby a "neglected" farm suddenly begins to grow like fermenting yeast, we immediately notice the **character** of the new leader, taking note, first and foremost, of his democratic approach. Narrow-minded lust for power never achieved anything exemplary, because it does not unite people, it disunites them. It creates around itself a magnetic field which attracts calculating toadies, picking them out from among the mass like a magnet attracting iron filings, bringing them closer and thereby dividing the collectives into strata of "supporters" and "opponents." A talented, democratic approach does the opposite: It brings a disparate mass together and orients it toward the common goal.

These effects of characters, if I can put it like that, that is, the disuniting or unifying of the collective, shape the leaders' different social bases—either the group or the collective—which, by the law of feedback, affect the character of their leader. The group promotes the development of the lust for power in the chracter, while the collective promotes the development of democracy. Hence the difficulty of reappraising yourself. The toadies will not at any price allow their "chief" ["vozhd"] to take a sober look at himself or doubt his infallibility, that is not to their advantage, and since it is not to their advantage, they form a wall in defense of him, using not open (public) [otkrytyye (glasnyye)] forms of the struggle against their adversaries, but secret, anonymous, backstage forms.

The first stage of the restructuring confirms this convincingly: Conflicts become protracted and, frankly, turn into squabbles in those collectives whose leaders are afflicted with the lust for power, and the process of self-reappraisal is thereby retarded. Among "democrats" squabbles do not happen, because the conflicts are open, they arise not in defense of the individual, but in defense of the cause. And if the cause is the criterion, then like it or not, you apply that yardstick to yourself and measure your own abilities against the cause.

In a certain collective the director has decided to dismiss a specialist who does not suit him. It is necessary to think up a way of "compromising" him. A morally weak toady is chosen for this purpose, and the desire is dictated to him: Suppose, friend, you were to write something, well, you know what we mean, no one is without sin... So the man writes an anonymous letter. The inspector arrives, a friend of our "Bonapartist," he consults people in the office and... submits it to the collective. At the meeting, it is the "public" who sets the tone, that same public that is ready on every occasion to come to the defense of its "indispensable" leader. The specialist is discredited, public opinion is indoctrinated, and the toadies on the trade union committee allow punishment to be meted out—the order is signed.

After that, there can be various options. If you submit, they will write "at his own request." If you want to remain in the collective in a rank and-file job, the lower-level chiefs will write on your application: "We do not need manpower." If you go to the people's court and get reinstated—don't expect any peace, the anonymous letters will come pouring in, and not only against you, but against those who sympathize with you. Passions flare up, and this turbulent wave will display the most characteristic features of the collective in question: whining and discord.

An enterprise led by a "Bonapartist" is not noted for its successes, on the contrary: There are plenty of deficiencies. With a view to self-justification, the "not guilty" formula is used—we asked for this, they did not supply it—a frankly consumerist formula that is extremely dangerous in terms of its destructive force. The formula is easily and firmly mastered by the leadership entourage, it is used to whitewash idleness and lack of zeal, the collective's dissatisfaction is directed toward external causes, somewhere "up above," where they "supply" everyone but miss us—a process of psychological self-disarmament sets in, with its inevitable accompaniment, whining. Everyone starts whining, on any pretext: "They didn't supply us," and this doleful note paralyzes the consciousness to such an extent that people are no longer capable of asking themselves: "But what did we do ourselves?" The whining spreads to the rayon, goes as far as the oblast, evokes "sympathy" and an "understanding of the situation"—something or other is said to the petitioners, but all the same it is no use whatever—no quotas or grants can goad idle consumers into energetic activity. Moaning becomes the constant background noise of a sluggish, unenterprising life, and it appears to the superficial glance that the collective is united and harmonious in its pleading, demanding tone. But the whole point is that there is no harmony, there is discord. There is probably some kind of law: Energetic activity unites, consumerism disunites. Even the immediate entourage of the "Bonapartist" is only united when demands are made on it, when it is required to work in exemplary manner; at other times it is a gossip club, a society for tittle-tattle, mutual complaints, and petty passions. Naturally, the collective cannot be cohesive either, envy gnaws away at it like rust on iron.

Do the "Bonapartist" leaders see these features of their collectives: the moaning and discord? Here you see your own reflection as if in a mirror, but the idea that it should be different does not occur to you. You have to change yourself, and that is painful. I do not think "Bonapartists" refashion themselves, at best they turn their coats, in their leadership seats, naturally. Transplanted to workbenches, perhaps they will find the strength to set about a reappraisal.

Experience reveals a curious detail: "Bonapartists" who are under attack from active forces in the collective turn to the services of the "shady service" ["temnyy servis"]. What is this? Distortions of democracy, in particular the suppression of glasnost, have created little groups of dissatisfied people specializing in anonymous denunciations. Formerly, the truth, or a grain of truth, could sometimes appear in their writings. But now, in the conditions of glasnost, they should give up their trade, but they cannot, the denunciatory itch gives them no peace, and they are prepared to write to anyone you like and about anyone you like, as long as they can get hold of a "nice little fact." These past masters of fault-finding deliberately seek out the "injured and persecuted," take notes, and "bring it to the notice" of those concerned. It is these busybodies, who find enjoyment in smear campaigns and have lost all sense of decency, that our "Bonapartists" appeal to when they find themselves in a tight spot. Anonymous letters written to dictation and received from outsiders are considered by the offices receiving them with particular attentiveness, as if they were totally unbiased. The "shady service" floated up like a dirty blot on the pure wave of the restructuring, and it is ready to serve those who are being thrown out of their comfortable nests by the growing process of cleansing.

The first stage of the restructuring is the "literacy campaign" for democracy. The masses have passed through it, and the "Bonapartists" nurtured by bureaucracy have passed through it. But the peculiarity of our campaign is that we passed through it in the old school, so to speak, that is, in the former economic situation, and the need to learn was not much of a support to us. Now we have to "stand on our own feet." It will be necessary to get out of the habit of saying "give me this" and into the habit of saying "get it yourself." It is hard to say how this will go.

But we can guess, and indeed we must. For instance, will dissension disappear? In theory, it should. Like in a beehive—we will all feed the one pot, from which we will all draw. But the point is that we will draw from it according to our services, according to our personal contribution: from you according to your abilities, to you according to your labor. Equality in principle, inequality in quantity. Will not "consumerist" discord turn into "producerist" discord? Experience says it will. Only, in my view, it should be called competitiveness. Whether that will happen depends entirely on... the character of the leader, on what predominates in him: authority or the lust for power, the "Bonapartist" or the democrat, whether the leader is capable by nature of rallying the collective in striving for the common goal. But another question arises here: He cannot manage without support, and what support is there in the new conditions? Under arbitrary administrative leadership, when there was a demand for "Bonapartists," the official group, the management group—champion of orders, instructions, and commands—provided the support. Now the leader will have to rely not on official zeal, but on proprietorial concern, irrespective of rank. This process of identifying and uniting those who care promises, in my view, to become a particular source of conflict—the reappraisal of abilities will begin.

Different criteria are needed, which must enter everyone's consciousness. We are accustomed, for instance, to assessing concern and conscientiousness according to the formula "work as if it was for yourself" or "think of it as your own property." If you take a closer look at today's country dweller, you will observe that he does not show all that much concern even about his own property. Garden plots, for instance. The Gosstroy fashion now is to build apartment blocks with the yard cut down to six hundredths of a hectare, and give people plots in the fields. Some of them are shameful to look at—weeds as tall as a man. Or official apartments: The doors have come off, the walls are dilapidated, the stove smokes, the barn has no roof... Yet all this is your own, for yourself... No, the old formula will not do, it is not appropriate for assessing concern. What, then? I think we must find a metaphor like the beehive. Economic accountability gives us back the true meaning of social (artel, cooperative, collective) ownership as the source of our prosperity. "Mine" and "the people's" is too great a leap, the distance is too long, the mind separates them, working for the people as if for yourself cannot be grasped. "The artel's" or "the collective's" is something visible, tangible, and comprehensible. So the criterion should be based on the size and quality of the contribution to the artel.

Questions of daily practice present the leader with much that is unaccustomed (or forgotten), and these questions must be tackled without delay. Here a key role will undoubtedly be played by character, by the degree to which it is democratic: Is the leader ready to renounce his own opinions, can he suppress pride and listen carefully to unbiased criticism, will he be able to rise above injured self-esteem—in a word, will he grasp, will he accept the necessity to be "governed from below"?

RSFSR Council of Ministers on Water Supply

PM271435 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Nov 87 Morning Edition p 2

[Unnamed special correspondent report: "At the RSFSR Council of Ministers"]

[Text] Under the heading of "Water Supply" the RSFSR Council of Ministers Presidium examined at its session the progress in building an integrated reservoir.

It was noted that the questions of the supply of water to the population, industry, agriculture, and municipal services in the RSFSR are being resolved unsatisfactorily. The annual plans for the sector have not once been fulfilled, and construction quality is poor too. Project documentation is not prepared in good time and insufficient funds are allocated.

The republic's Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources, other interested ministries and departments, and local soviet organs have been instructed to take additional measures to eliminate the lag in 1988-1990 and to wholly meet the requirements of the population and the republic's economy for good-quality water.

The presidium also examined the question of the unsatisfactory construction of health care projects, kindergartens, and creches through funds obtained as a result of all-union communist subbotniks, and adopted a corresponding resolution.

The session was chaired by V.I. Vorotnikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers.

Tsentrosoyuz Council on Consumer Cooperatives

LD281109 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 27 Nov 87

[Text] Restructuring the activity of consumer cooperatives and improving their organizational structure in light of the decisions of the June 1987 plenum of the CPSU Central Committee was the subject of a meeting of the Council of the Tsentrosoyuz held today in Moscow. The report of Comrade (Fidirko), chairman of the Tsentrosoyuz board, and the speeches noted that great scope for developing the activity of consumer cooperatives was opened in the period of restructuring and profound renewal of Soviet society. However, there are major shortcomings in the sector: Many leaders of cooperative organizations and enterprises lack sufficient ability to conduct in-depth analyses of the state of affairs and critical assessments of results or to overcome obsolete forms and methods of work. It is intended to transfer cooperative organizations and enterprises to full financial autonomy and self-financing. The council approved measures to extend the foreign economic activity of consumer cooperatives.

Comrade Nikonov, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, spoke at the meeting of the council.

Demichev Decorates Moscow Chief Rabbi

LD241409 Moscow TASS in English 1046 GMT 24 Nov 87

[Text] Moscow November 24 TASS—Petr Demichev, first vice-president of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, presented the Order of People's Friendship to Adolf Shayevich, head Rabbi of the Moscow Choral Synagogue, in the Kremlin today.

The order was conferred on Rabbi Shayevich for his patriotic work for the benefit of peace.

Official on Jewish Emigration 'Campaign'

LD271555 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1430 GMT 27 Nov

[Text] Moscow, 27 Nov (TASS)—A TASS diplomatic correspondent reports:

The recent activity of Zionist organizations in the United States is a premeditated campaign intended to exacerbate the atmosphere surrounding the forthcoming summit meeting and to impede the development of Soviet-U.S. relations, Feliks Stanevskiy, deputy chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Humanitarian and Cultural Ties Administration, said today in an interview with a TASS diplomatic correspondent. It is undoubtedly those who are not interested in real progress along the path of nuclear missile disarmament who are taking part in these actions. They are the very same forces that are obstructing the businesslike and constructive resolution of humanitarian issues in relations between the USSR and the United States.

Zionist organizations are expounding in detail on the allegation that persons of Jewish nationality are being oppressed in the USSR. Meanwhile, the truth of this matter is that Jews in the Soviet Union have the same rights as other nations, are represented on an equal basis in executive and legislative organs of power and participate in the affairs of society on the same basis as everyone else. In a nutshell, they enjoy the very same rights as representatives of the other nationalities of our country.

I shall give some objective data. Jews comprise 0.7% of the overall total of the population of the Soviet Union. Citizens of Jewish nationality account for 5.3% of the USSR's scientific workers, 6% of cultural and artistic workers, and 6% of lawyers. Nearly 25% of Soviet Jews have higher education. I think, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman stressed, that Jews in the United States, in other Western countries, or even in Israel itself do not have such an opportunity to acquire higher education as they have in the Soviet Union.

New regulations on emigration from the USSR have been in operation since the start of this year, the deputy chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Administration said. By 1 November more than 22,000 emigration permits for permanent residence abroad had been issued. The number of temporary visas and visas for personal matters is increasing. Such trips are possible for meetings with relatives and acquaintances, not to mention tourist trips.

One gains the impression that the Zionists in the United States are by no means seeking the opportunity to emigrate from the Soviet Union for persons of European nationality but are striving to use the coming Soviet-U.S. meeting as a pretext to fan up a sensation over the invented issue. Indeed, the current passions, which are deliberately running high in the United States, come at a time when the volume of emigration from the USSR has increased significantly. It is astounding that the more people leave the more noise there is over this artificially created problem.

It is important to note that the number of those wishing to leave the USSR to live abroad is not great. In all there are presently several thousand people raising the matter of emigration. Just 400-500 people are asking to go to Israel. It is typical that, having obtained permission to emigrate to Israel, people delay their departure, they vacillate. There are already hundreds of cases of rejection on the part of people who have permission to go. The number of refusals of permission to emigrate from the USSR is not great. More than 90% of those making representations about emigration for permanent residence abroad receive permission, F. Stanevskiy stressed.

Turkmen Interior Minister Explains Visas

LD261451 Moscow TASS in English 1434 GMT 26 Nov 87

[Text] Ashkhabad November 26 TASS—By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Rybak:

The family of Imberi Rohus, a Soviet citizen of German nationality, left Turkmenia for the Federal Republic of Germany to reunite with their relatives. Thus, a file was emptied, which contained requests to leave for permanent residence abroad at the visa-issuing authority (Ovir) of the interior ministry of this central Asian republic.

That these requests were met was largely due to the resolution of the USSR Council of Ministers "On Introducing Additions to the Regulations on Entering and Leaving the USSR", which came into force on January 1 this year. It significantly widened the provisions concerning the reunification of families, speeded up and simplified the procedure of considering requests and issuing visas.

"The regulations set a definite dateline for considering requests for temporary entrance into the USSR and exist from the USSR on private matters as well for permanent residence," the republic's Minister of the Interior Vasiliy Grinin explained. "Requests are considered within one month. If the trip is connected with visiting seriously ill people or with the death of a relative, within three days. The applicant is informed about the results of considering the request, and in case of refusal about its motives."

For example, seven requests were filed with Ovir this year to allow the invitation of relatives to the USSR from Iran. All of them were satisfied. On the whole, the number of people entering and leaving the USSR this year for permanent and temporary residence increased more than 100 per cent as compared with the same period last year.

Conference Considers Mankind's 'Problems'

LD282352 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1505 GMT 28 Nov

[Excerpts] Tashkent, 28 Nov (TASS)—A frank and constructive discussion concerning the problems which are of interest to mankind was held today at the international conference 'For a Nuclear-free and Non-Coercive World', which is dedicated to the first anniversary of the Delhi declaration. It is taking place in the capital of Uzbekistan (a Soviet republic in Central Asia). [passage omitted]

In honor of participants of the international conference 'For a Nuclear-Free and Non-Coercive World' the Government of Uzbekistan gave a dinner, which took place in a warm and friendly atmosphere. Petr Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet; Inamzhon Usmankhodzhayev, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan, and other officials were present.

World Muslim Congress Delegation Visits Moscow

LD241203 Moscow TASS in English 0745 GMT 24 Nov 87

[Text] Baku November 24 TASS—"Muslims in the USSR are enjoying freedom of creed and are taking an active part in the life of society", Dr Ma'ruf al-Dawalibi, president of the World Muslim Congress, has told TASS. A delegation of the World Muslim Congress have come to this country to acquaint themselves with the life of Soviet Muslims at the invitation of Muslim organizations of the USSR. The guests toured Moscow, Tashkent and Samarkand (cities in the Soviet republic of Uzbekistan) and Baku, capital of Azerbaijan, a Soviet Transcaucasian republic. They visited mosques there and attended public prayers. The delegation were received at the Supreme Soviet of Azerbaijan.

"It is my first visit to the USSR, and I am very glad that I saw for myself how my bretheren in creed live here. We welcome enormous efforts exerted by the Soviet Union in the struggle for general disarmament and attach tremendous importance to the coming meeting of Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan, because the two great powers are to sign a treaty on the elimination of intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles. Let us pray to the merciful Allah that this step pleasing to the Almighty and meeting the aspirations of humankind in general should be taken", Dr Ha'ruf al-Dawalibi said in conclusion.

Vorontsov Receives Congress Leader

LD272315 Moscow TASS in English 1906 GMT 27 Nov 87

[Text] Moscow November 27 TASS—Today Yuliy Vorontsov, first deputy USSR Foreign Minister, received Maruf al-Dawalibi, chairman of the World Muslim Congress (WMC). He leads a WMC delegation which arrived in the USSR at the invitation of Soviet Muslim organizations.

During the talk the sides emphasized the need for active participation of all peace-loving forces in the general campaign for removing the nuclear threat, for strengthening international peace and security and for a just settlement of regional conflicts, including the Arab-Israeli conflict, through peaceful, political means. There was a useful exchange of opinions on settling the situation around Afghanistan, as well as on ways of the earliest end to the Iran-Iraq war and improvement of the situation in the Persian Gulf.

Visit Ends

LD290023 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1520 GMT 28 Nov

[Text] Moscow, 28 Nov (TASS)—A delegation from the World Muslim Congress, which spent 10 days in the USSR at the invitation of the Islamic organizations of the USSR, has ended its visit. The delegation, headed by Dr Muhammad Ma'ruf al-Dawalibi, chairman of the World Muslim Congress, had the opportunity to learn of the life of their co-religionists in Moscow and Leningrad, as well as in such traditional areas for them as the Uzbek and Azerbaijan republics.

The leaders of the congress were present at public prayers in mosques, talked to representatives of the clergy and to believers, and got acquainted with monuments of Islamic architecture in Tashkent, Samurkand, and Baku.

The program of the Islamic delegation's visit included meetings not only with religious leaders, but also with public leaders and leaders of state. In particular, in Moscow they were received by Petr Demichev, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and by Yuliy Vorontsov, USSR first deputy minister of foreign affairs. Members of the delegation visited the USSR Council of Ministers Council for Religious Affairs, the USSR ministry of Culture, and other establishments and organizations.

In a talk with journalists on the eve of the departure from Moscow, Dr al-Dawalibi noted that he was satisfied with the results of the visit. The head of the delegation underlined that he places great hopes on the impending Soviet-U.S. summit meeting.

Stating that he is a consistent advocate of dialogue, Dr al-Dawalibi expressed the conviction that peace cannot be built on fear. With today's level of arms, war cannot be waged: neither vanquished nor victors will remain on earth.

"We hope," he continued, "that during the talks between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan new steps will be taken toward reinforcing peace. The dreams of the peoples of the world about peace and security will find a path to implementation."

The chairman of the World Muslim Congress made particular mention of the realism and good sense of the Soviet leadership's new thinking. He added that he closely follows all the speeches by the Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev, through press articles, and that he is reading his books.

On the subject of the Afghan problem, the religious and political figure from Saudi Arabia said that he believes in the sincerity of the Soviet government's intentions when it states that Soviet troops will be withdrawn from Afghanistan.

Muhammad Ma'ruf al-Dawalibi, who, in his own words, has had dealings with the Soviet Union over several decades by virtue of his political activities, pointed out that during his trip he saw that positive processes are underway in the USSR as regards freedom of worship. "I visited mosques, delivered sermons everywhere, and saw the joyful and open faces of Soviet Muslims. I am satisfied with what I saw," he said.

First Unit at Khmelnitskiy AES Starts Up

PM241258 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Nov 87 Second Edition p 2

[PRAVDA correspondent M. Odinets report: "Khmelnitskiy AES Starts Up"]

[Text] Khmelnitskiy—Not far from the city of Slavuta, the Khmelnitskiy AES has been under construction for some years now. The time has come at last for the physical startup of the first power unit. After the completion of a hot and cold test run, a comprehensive review of the reactor equipment was carried out. Although this was done very thoroughly and scrupulously, the work was finished ahead of schedule. During the hot test run a special team from Atommash helped to eliminate small deviations from the design. Nuclear fuel is now being loaded into the reactor of the first power unit, and in the brief time planned for this operation, the fuel assemblies will be put into position by machine.

CPSU Lecturers' Seminar Views Restructuring

PM241033 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Nov 87 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "On the Experience of Building Socialism"]

[Text] Participants in an all-union seminar "The Historical Experience of the CPSU in the Light of the 70th Anniversary of Great October" which ended in the capital today analyzed various stages of the building of socialism in our country. It was attended by more than 1,000 party committee lecturers, propagandists, and "Znaniye" Society activists.

At the focus of the participants' attention were topical problems of the current stage of restructuring. The themes "Great October and the Present-day World," "The Implementation of the Party's Nationality Policy: Successes and Problems," and others attracted special interest.

The seminar was organized by the All-Union "Znaniye" Society Board and the USSR Academy of Sciences History Department.

Participants were addressed by V.V. Zagladin, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department.

Publication of Banned Novels Examined

PM241043 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 18 Nov 87 p 2

[Letter from S. Mikhaylova, senior lecturer at the USSR State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade All-Union Institute for Boosting the Qualifications of Press Workers: "Eliminating the 'Blank Spots'"]

[Text] Quite recently I made the acquaintance of the chief of a main administration of a technical ministry, an economist by profession. On learning of my special field, this comrade exclaimed: "Ah, an idler! People are working and tending machine tools while all you do is read books." He was quite convinced that specialist literature alone should be produced and that the only concern should be to step up labor productivity. Unfortunately, you meet this sort of viewpoint quite often.

The nature of my work means that I have to give lectures to a very varied audience.

Questions, questions... There is no end to the questions at lectures nowadays. Often there are questions like: "What do you lot think you are doing? You're planning to print that anti-Soviet work *Doctor Zhivago*." I ask: "Have you read it?" "I haven't read it and I won't read that filth." Just recently I received the following note: "How could party and soviet organs sanction the printing of Ye. Zamyatin's counterrevolutionary novel *We*?" Once again I asked: "Have you read it?" "I haven't read it, but I have read the articles in the Concise Literary Encyclopedia and the Soviet Encyclopedic Dictionary." My listener's difficulty is quite understandable. "*We*," I read in the Concise Literary Encyclopedia, "is a malicious lampoon on the Soviet state." The Soviet Encyclopedic Dictionary claims that the novel *We* is directed against socialism. Even literary critics have been ruthless with Zamyatin.

But is it not time today to be honest and say that Zamyatin wrote a cautionary novel not against socialism but against the transformation of socialism into a barracks, against the development of the personality cult, which is necessarily accompanied by disregard for people's personality, feelings, and thoughts, and against the cultivation of a servile mentality.

Asked "What have you read by Yu. Olesha?" an adult audience replies in unison: *The Three Fat Men*. Only a few know of Platonov. Almost no one has heard of B. Lavrenev's tale *The Woodcut*, which was written back in the twenties and is still relevant today.

Today we need to fill in the literary map, adding new mountain peaks and the names of new cities, settlements, and villages. "The people are incomplete without me," one of A. Platonov's heroes said. This is the absolute truth. Without the writer Platonov not only the people but also literature are quite incomplete.

What is to be done? How can we eliminate the "blank spots" in the knowledge of readers whose tastes are established and those whose tastes are only just emerging?

I think that the All-Union Voluntary Society of Book Lovers must undertake the difficult and painstaking but very necessary work of "introducing forgotten writers' names" today. You often read and hear from the society's workers themselves that the nature of their work is somewhat vague. I find this difficult to understand. The main channel is book propaganda; moreover vital, impassioned, competent, propaganda precisely aiming to foster a need to read better works of literature.

We must not spare any efforts in publicizing noteworthy works of Soviet literature and in fostering taste, dialectical and critical thinking, and the ability to discuss and uphold one's viewpoint and civic stance.

Failings of Political Publishing Discussed

PM271151 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Nov 87 Second Edition p 3

[Article by M. Nenashev, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade, under the rubric "Problems and Judgments": "Political Books"]

[Text] If people stop reading, a philosopher of the past asserted, they will stop thinking. On looking at the characteristics of our times, you notice that Soviet people today read more than ever before and think more than ever about the social and economic problems of society. This is convincingly attested by the increased prestige and the constantly growing truly astronomic circulations of our newspapers and journals. In 1987 alone there have been 19 million new subscribers to newspapers and journals.

The documents and materials published in connection with Great October's 70th anniversary and M.S. Gorbachev's book *"Restructuring and the New Thinking for Our Country and the Whole World"* have aroused tremendous interest in the history and the contemporary problems of Soviet society. Books by the scientists Abel Aganbegyan and Tatyana Zaslavskaya, the publicists Ivan Vasilyev and Yuriy Chernichenko, and many others elicit a great public response.

At the same time, it has to be seen that the situation in which political books now found themselves in our country is very distinctive. On the one hand, the interest in sociopolitical literature aroused by the changes taking place in the country in the course of restructuring is greater than ever. But, on the other hand, the inability of books of this kind, in their present form, to meet the Soviet people's needs in full has also become obvious.

Some 12,000 book and brochure titles on sociopolitical topics are published annually in the USSR, with print runs of approximately 300 million copies. But far from all of them are in demand among readers. It is clear that political books have in many respects lost a wide readership and ceased to have mass appeal. Their average print run now stands at 25,300 copies, and even less in the republics—only approximately 9,000 copies. The process of the fall in these levels and, at the same time, the increase in remaindered, unsold political literature are growing steadily. According to the annual register of unsold literature, today 52.5% of its range in terms of the number of copies consists precisely of books on sociopolitical topics. During the 5 year period from 1980 through 1985 unsold print runs increased by 3.5%. What is more, whereas the average percentage of all unsold books in the country stands at 2.3%, it is far higher in the sociopolitical publishing houses such as *Politizdat*, *Izvestiya*, and *Progress*—5.5%, 5.1%, and 4.9% respectively. The situation which has taken shape requires us, without either dramatizing or concealing the problems which exist here, to investigate the reasons for the appearance of gray, drab books and to determine measures to help us to enhance the prestige of this type of literature.

Political books vividly reflect the state of sociopolitical thought. The long absence of an exchange of opinions, of polemics, and of a search for answers to urgent problems of Soviet society's development was bound to have an adverse effect also on this kind of literature. It gave expression to the formalism, blather, and cliches which were inherent in our propaganda in the recent past. It was with regard to such books that M.S. Gorbachev said at the CPSU Central Committee January (1987) Plenum: "...Many mediocre, drab works have appeared which have given nothing either to the mind or to the senses."

Where do the origins of this approach lie? It seems to me that one of them lies in the choice of the targeted guidelines for political books. We know that a considerable proportion of sociopolitical literature was earmarked for study in the system of political education. For a long time the existence of an organized system of party, Komsomol, trade union, political, and economic education in many ways freed both the authors and the publishers from any concern about creating books that would arouse readers' lively interest. In addition, houses and rooms of political education took it upon themselves to disseminate these books under the special rubric "To Aid Students." Unfortunately, it has to be admitted in a self-critical way that the publication of such books has changed little even now.

Of course, we are certainly not inclined to suppose that the revolutionary changes taking place in Soviet society will by themselves bring into being without delay vivid, topical books which accord with the spirit of the times and are capable of reflecting in full the complex process of restructuring. And yet 2 and 1/2 years have elapsed since the CPSU Central Committee April Plenum. It is time that books, too, started talking the language of restructuring at the top of their voices. Alas, this has not happened. I will cite the facts to corroborate what I say.

Last July the USSR State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade prepared a review of the mass political literature produced by republic and oblast publishing houses to propagandize and realize the 27th CPSU Congress decisions. This review indicates that the authors of many works still continue to assess the contemporary stage in the development of Soviet society from old positions. Let us take, for example, the series *"Conveying the Ideas of the 27th CPSU Congress to the Masses"*, published in Uzbekistan. An ostentatious narrative, an abudance of truisms and general phrases, and verbosity predominate in the majority of the books in the series, such as Ye. Tatybayev's brochure *"Leninist Norms of Party Life,"* A. Saidov's *"Soviet Society's Political System,"* and others, instead of an analysis of specific negative phenomena in the republic's recent past.

Another very typical shortcoming of political books in recent years has been the lack of a target readership. With the best will in the world, I cannot, for example, name a work which has been in particularly wide demand with a particular, specific category of readers, such as workers, engineering and technical personnel, the creative intelligentsia, or veterans, or which has been popular in the family.

When analyzing the causes of all these misfortunes in the world of political books, there is no getting away from the fact that it is the publishing workers themselves, above all, who are to blame for the present situation. However regrettable it may be, precisely editors were the first and most zealous custodians of cliches in the creation of this kind of literature. The process of standardizing books and destroying the author's individuality took place with their direct participation. The fact is that the most influential people in publishing houses in recent years have been overcautious people who know well how to prepare a book which will give rise neither to questions nor to complaints, and the ousting of truly talented and original works from our publishing houses is precisely on their conscience.

When speaking of the origins of the emergence of unpopular political books, we must not keep quiet about their authors because, however much depends on publishing practice, the author is still responsible for the future book's appearance, contents, and topicality. Who are they, the authors of political books?

VUZ social science teachers make up the first and most significant category among them. It is they who lead in the writing of sociopolitical literature and who in many ways shape its appearance and style. These people have brought to the substance of the works they have written the same shortcomings that were inherent in the teaching of the social sciences: dogmatism, avoidance of the urgent, "acute" social problems of the present day, and reluctance to understand young people and captivate them with the creative substance of Marxism-Leninism.

Unfortunately, little has changed in this sphere even now. At any rate a survey of the monographic publications on sociopolitical topics published by the Ukrainian SSR's *"Vyshcha Shkola"* Publishing House in 1986-1987 confirms our conclusion. The majority of them lack the requisite scientific quest and do not display a realistic approach toward analyzing contemporary economic and social problems. The books are full of a dogmatic interpretation of the laws and categories of socialism and socialist democracy. They do not even attempt to analyze any negative phenomena or facts of social development in recent years. With such an approach individual authors—for example, I. Ivanenko in the book *"The Education of Committed Internationalist-Patriots"*—regard the principled decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress as a concept of improvement, not restructuring. Old approaches to evaluating cooperative ownership and commodity-money relations predominate in Ye. Gerasimov's monograph *"The Dialectics of Labor and the Improvement of Socialism."* The author attempts to substantiate his attitude to cooperatives, subsidiary plots, and individual labor activity as something alien to socialism. Similar shortcomings are also inherent to one extent or another in other *"Vyshcha Shkola"* publications. Party workers make up the second significant category—in terms of composition—of authors of political books. Of course, their works include many that are worthy and have authority among readers. However, a sizable proportion of the books written by them display an ostentatious, declarative approach to analyzing the activities of oblast and republic party organizations and oversimplify and varnish actual reality. Laggardness in party practices and cadre deformations which caused certain workers to degenerate into know-it-all party bureaucrats were bound to have an adverse effect on the contents of political books. And you could hardly expect a substantive book from party committee secretaries when you knew that their authorship was very dubious and hypothetical, for reports and speeches prepared by others were frequently passed off as an original work of literature. The thousands-strong print runs of "remaindered" sets of books [knizhnyye bloki] at depots and in stores, printed on first-grade paper, with which only recently certain oblast, kray, and republic leaders were sure to crown their term in office are a living reminder of the recent past and a lesson for the future.

Today the role and significance of political books in the life of our society have increased considerably. This was pointed out in the decisions of the 27th party congress and the subsequent Central Committee plenums. But what must be done to ensure that books that are really topical for the people appear in the necessary numbers? Among the most radical and top-priority measures that should be implemented I would name, above all, the expediency of a considerable reduction in the number of book titles published. Such a step would lead to a reduction in the number of weak publications and, at the same time, would make it possible to make sensible use of the authors' potential for writing and promptly producing talented books in large print runs.

In my view, another important measure which will undoubtedly have a beneficial effect on the content of political books would be to combine the efforts of publishing houses with the vast potential of the mass media—newspapers, journals, and television. This would help political books to make use of all that is best in recent newspaper and journal publications. Then the impassioned voice of journalists will also be heard in books as they reveal the urgent problems of restructuring which are now of concern to Soviet people. The initial experience of this kind of integration with the mass media is already bearing fruit for publishing houses. For example, more than 50 books written by well known newspaper and journal journalists have been published this year. Anthologies of articles published in 1986-1987 in *Pravda, Sovetskaya Kultura, Sovetskaya Rossiya,* and the journal *Kommunist* are also in demand. This practice helps not only to improve the quality and increase the topicality of political books but also to speed up their publication by two-three times.

Our time, with its diversity, wealth, and dynamism of events obliges us to continue thinking about improving conventional forms of sociopolitical book publication. For instance, in addition to monographs and studies, which take 2-3 years to write and edit, there is also an increasing urgency about the publication of reportages, dialogues, and chronicles written at the scene of the event and published within 2-3 months. Unlike customary monographs, these publications present a completely different kind of work on the part of the editor, who is not simply concerned with stylistic faults but plays the part of a coauthor and an active participant in the dialogue or reportage and who is capable of redefining the genre of the book and sharing in its creation from conception to publication.

The main criterion for assessing the editor's work now should not be the conventional yardstick of radical intervention in the content of a manuscript to the point of rewriting it but the amount of skillful editorial consultation and the channeling of the author's efforts to enable him to reveal in full his creative thought and individuality.

All these urgent changes in work with political literature can only be accomplished on the basis of a consistent democratization of the publishing process. What I have in mind is the completion of the restructuring of publishing in the country, a restructuring which is already in progress but which now needs substantial support from party committees, because the force of inertia is still too strong, as is the habit of administering and commanding in the old manner and of deciding all questions—what and whom to publish—on behalf of publishing houses.

The greatest harm has been done to publishing by mindless obedience and work solely on direction from above. Restructuring must give publishing houses a real and not merely theoretical right to full independence when it comes to tackling all creative and production questions and above all when dealing with the main question—thematic planning. It is the publishing house collective itself which must define the current and long-term publishing plans, the number of titles to be published, and the amount of each title, participate actively in deciding the print run, and have the right to refuse any author's unjustified demands. The democratization of publishing means freeing it from the shackles of bureaucracy and formalism, observing a rational correlation between the trust and responsibility of the editor and those of the author for the book in question, and abandoning the large number of reviews and assessments, which prevent true creativity from showing through and the author's intention from being realized.

The democratization of the publishing process means compulsory glasnost and openness in all thematic plans and publishing decisions and actions. This condition is obligatory, because I am convinced that it is secrecy and the closed nature of publishing which makes possible the appearance of a whole stream of drab books, manifestations of various publishing malpractices, and the many instances of favoritism.

There is also an urgent need today to create an effective mechanism for studying readers' demands. A start has already been made—a book research institute has been set up within the system of the USSR State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade and is to be the country's leading sociological center for the study of social demands regarding book publishing.

Criticism must be the most important means of influencing public opinion to improve the publication of political books. In recent years we have complained fairly about serious shortcomings in the criticism of artistic literature, the cinema, and the theater. But when it comes to criticism of sociopolitical literature it would be no exaggeration to claim that it is totally lacking.

It cannot be said that publishers in these conditions were beyond criticism. But criticism bore, as a rule, a purely directive nature in the form of numerous official reviews, memoranda, and criticisms made at publishing conferences and meetings. The party with the greatest interest—the reader—took no part in these evaluations and actions. We now need a completely different atmosphere surrounding sociopolitical books which are either in preparation or have been published. We have an urgent need for open and frank criticism which would enable the public and the reader to take an active part in producing the political books that the people need.

In my view, the role of the USSR State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade must also change considerably during the restructuring of publishing. In the conditions of the significant expansion of the rights and independence of publishing houses, the State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade is called on to be a state client—with the aid of various social institutions and on the basis of a comprehensive study of public opinion and readers' demands, it must determine the real priority areas and topical themes which publishing must tackle in a timely way.

One of the most important tasks of the USSR State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade is to prepare new manuals and textbooks. The main aim here is to improve their quality and further expand the competition system. Competitions have already been announced for VUZ textbooks for philosophy, political economy, and scientific communism. It is also necessary to extend the conditions of competitive preparation to manuals in the political enlightenment system, too.

Finally, for a major improvement in the publishing of political books it is necessary to create most-favored status for them and to resolve a number of questions relating to material incentives for authors and editors working with sociopolitical literature. For example, it is completely unjustified to set authors' royalties for political publications at a considerably lower rate than for artistic publications. A useful measure which would promote the influx of talented authors would be to institute three or four prizes a year for the best mass publication on a sociopolitical theme. I also believe that the practice of price formation under conditions of economic accountability should be an incentive to the publication of sociopolitical literature, because at present the publication of many political books, even with a print run of 50,000-100,000 copies, is unprofitable. It would also be right to involve the best artistic talents in the design and illustration of political books and to finally eliminate the stereotype whereby these publications as a rule have no worthwhile illustrations at all.

The production of a political book which is topical and interesting is a great social event. And it must be made such by its very nature, that is, it is necessary to establish a good tradition of public presentation of all new political books and of extensive coverage of them by the mass media. There is every reason for the production of a new, useful, and necessary book to be given an extensive public presentation—no less than the launch of a new ship, the completion of the construction of another important national economic project, or the attainment of another sports record.

The implementation of these measures will make it possible to raise the prestige of political literature and help it become worthy of its time.

Lenin Warned Stalin Against 'Local Anarchy'

PM240841 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 46, 15 Nov 87 p 13

[Arkadiy Vaksberg article: "Old Lessons Revised. Lenin About the Guarantees of Legality"—italics as published]

[Text] The drama of life often surpasses human imagination.This long-familiar truth is never out of date, as testified, for example, by the fact that Lenin's famous letter, " 'Dual' Subordination and Legality" (1922) was addressed to Stalin. The letter outlining the fundamental principles of Soviet justice, which was then in the making, was meant for the Political Bureau, but addressed to Stalin. At that time Stalin could not deal with legal issues either directly or indirectly. Nor could Lenin possibly foresee how terribly his addressee was soon to excel in "justice".

In 1922, it was for purely formal reason that Stalin had the honour to be addressed by Lenin on the matters of justice. He had just been made General Secretary whose duties, among other things, included such organizational functions as familiarizing members of the Politbureau with the material submitted for discussion. Apparently there was no other reason for sending the letter to Stalin, but in retrospect, the fact that Lenin chose to explain the basic principles of law to Stalin acquired symbolic meaning.

Here is an extended quote from the letter: "...the root evil of our social life, and of our lack of culture, is our pandering to the ancient Russian view and semisavage habit of mind, which wishes to preserve Kaluga law as distinct from Kazan law."

This is Lenin's warning against the serious danger of provincial arbitrariness and lawlessness which could emerge as the result of the revolutionary break-up of the old law system and the nation's abiding disrespect for law. The word "culture" turned up four times in the text of this four-page letter. Lenin associated culture with the guaranteed observance of law. For him lack of culture meant lawlessness. He derided the view that *"culture and law, which is its necessary concomitant,* are... highly developed in our country" (Ital. by A.V.) and demanded that proper juridical forms were found to restrict arbitrariness and lack of culture. He insisted that those forms should take into consideration the deep-rooted mentality of the people who had been denied legal rights for centuries; the powerful centrifugal tendencies of former feudal principalities which degenerated into local influence; and the isolation from a civilized world which had developed a habit of democratic self-rule not by compelling, but by encouraging citiznes to abide by the law conforming to the individual's moral norms.

What sort of "Kaluga law" worried Lenin as the "root evil" of our social life? Perhaps, it was the sort of law that later became notorious under the name of "legal amateurism": the orgies of regional decisions and regulations constraining the individual citizen's every step and move for the sake of official convenience. Such lawlessness pretending to be the law is the consequence of one fundamental cause, namely, the extremely low level of the population's legal awareness born of Russia's age-long history which taught people to distrust the court and the law, and to see them as the tools of oppression and reprisal rather than the instruments of protection against arbitrary rule. For centuries, local authorities strove to work out regulations that would serve their immediate interests and aspirations, whether or not these agreed with fundamental social interests and the law in general. For centuries, the population strove to obviate the barriers built on their way and lost all confidence in legal protection or justice at court.

In his letter to the members of the Political Bureau Lenin outlined both the long-term programme of combatting this "lack of culture", and the short-term programme of concrete action to be taken immediately. With a view to maintaining the uniformity of the law all over the country, he proposed to establish a nationwide system of procuratorship subordinated solely to the central authority and independent of local influence.

Lenin's proposal was accepted and the procuratorship established, notably on the basis of vertical subordination Lenin had insisted upon. Why then do the problems which worried him in 1922, apparently settled there, continue worrying us today?

For the sake of clarity, let us confine ourselves to just one of the reasons which explain the tenacity of the evil in question, the one that is directly pertinent to Lenin's letter of 1922. Let us recall that Lenin regarded the subordination of prosecutors to local authorities as incompatible with legality. He proposed to "establish the subordination of local procurators solely to the *central authority...*" To this day, all procurators are nominated from Moscow and are formally independent of local authorities.

But only formally. In real fact, the procurator who is not subordinated to the local authorities is more dependent on them than on the central authority he is formally subordinated to. This is due to one particular factor which Lenin could not possibly take into consideration in 1922, because it did not then play the role it has acquired since. The procurators are nominated and discharged by the central authority in consultation with local authorities. In most cases, the latter recommend the candidates for nomination. In other words, the "dual" subordination which Lenin considered incompatible with guaranteed legality is very much in evidence and running smoothly, because Moscow is far away, and the local authorities are close at hand. Practically everything depends on them, including the everyday necessities which cannot be ignored lightly. Should the custodian of the law appear too refractory, he might be put under the conditions that would make him unable to uphold his high principles.

More than once have I met principled lawyers, staunch in their duty and fighting courageously against all sorts of pressure. But the forces are unequal. The local procurator cannot fight single-handed against the powerful machinery of local authorities often backed up by people in higher places. What could an honest procurator do, for instance, in Uzbekistan, where local officials had the support of regional bosses backed by none other than First Secretary of the Republic's Central Committee?

To eradicate local anarchy in legal matters does not mean to disregard specific local features. The dialectical combination of the two was emphasized in Lenin's letter. He demanded that "in determining the penalty, all local circumstances must be taken into consideration...." When deciding an individual offender's lot the court must have "the right to say that although there has been a definite infringement of the law in a given case, nevertheless, certain circumstances, with which local people are closely familiar, and which come to light in the local court, compel the court to mitigate the penalty to which the culprit is liable, or even acquit him. Unless we strictly adhere to this most elementary condition... it will be utterly impossible... to develop any kind of culture".

The above quote, especially its first part, is quite well known. Yet our historical experience and existing court practice should prompt us to pay close attention to Lenin's topical thoughts.

Who are the "local people" whose knowledge of the local circumstances should weigh so heavily in court? Did Lenin mean the local judge, investigating officer or counsel for the prosecution? A professional lawyer of the highest qualification, Lenin could hardly call those persons "local people". It is evident that he meant the opinion of the local population. It is the public opinion that should be taken into consideration by the court if the judiciary do not want to set their notion of justice against that of the masses.

Had Lenin's precept been acted upon, the court would have never convicted Ivan Snimshchikov, Chairman of an impoverished collective farm near Moscow, who managed to revive the farm within the shortest time possible by letting his people engage in handicrafts, the occupation forbidden by the local law at that time.

Nor would the court have convicted Ivan Khudenko, director of a state farm in Kazakhstan, who took the "liberty" to spend state money to organize his workforce in such a way (after he got rid of idlers, blabbers and drunks) that the per capita income on the farm grew eightfold, and the wages grew fourfold.

There would have been no criminal proceedings against Viktor Belokon, Hero of Socialist Labour, head of a collective farm near Odessa, who saved his farm from imminent ruin by turning to a "dealer" who managed to procure, through unofficial channels, the roofing for ramshackle dairy farms and granaries.

All those men (and hundreds of other managers, directors, engineers and shop stewards, who had to fulfil the plan and provide the livelihood for the people subordinated to them while labouring under all sorts of constraints and vetoes) looked for ways to obviate bureaucratic restrictions, because the objective demand was more powerful than subjective administration akin to despotism.

True, in a number of cases, "there has been a definite infringement of the law", but the local people knew very well why it happened. They knew the mitigating circumstances which made the stern verdicts unjustified and therefore unlawful. Formally, the court was right, but its decision ran contrary to the public opinion. The judiciary proved ignorant of "this most elementary condition", without which "it will be utterly impossible... to develop any kind of culture".

Well, of course, there were conscientious and unbiassed lawyers who understood the situation as well as the "local people" did. They tried as hard as they could to comply to "the most elementary condition" by dropping the obviously unjust charges and passing mild sentences on the so-called "shabashniks" (the hustlers) who often saved lame enterprises from ruin. The acquittal admitted by Lenin was absolutely out of the question in such cases. Yet lenient judges were invariably reprimanded by "higher" judiciary, because everybody was supposed to toe the line. Lenin's most valuable lesson of combining the uniform law with due regard for local circumstances was being quoted in legal books and lectures but never acted upon in practice.

How do things stand now? I would rather abstain from rash conclusions for lack of accurate up-to-date information. The forthcoming broad legal reform is sure to tackle a number of long-standing problems. Lenin's ideas are sure to be of great help in resolving them. The most important thing is to stop paying lip service to Lenin's teachings and pass on to actively adhering to them.

Revised 1917 Revolution Encyclopedia Reviewed

PM231507 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 13 Nov 87 p 3

[N. Georgiyev "Book Review": "The Great October Encyclopedia"]

[Text] There is enormous worldwide interest in the history of our socialist state. It will be satisfied to a great extent by the third edition of the encyclopedia entitled "The Great October Socialist Revolution" [Velikaya Oktyabrskaya Sotsialisticheskaya Revolyutsiya] (Soviet Encyclopedia Publishing House), comprising a vast quantity of material referring to the times of the preparation and accomplishment of the October Revolution.

More than 2,000 articles, published in alphabetical order, cover the main historical events and provide much additional information and facts.

Readers will learn about the intense leadership activity of the party and its leader, V.I. Lenin. The encyclopedia contains narratives about the armed forces of the revolution, the country's industrial enterprises whose workers were the mainstay of the revolution, and the active fighters for Soviet power.

The third edition of encyclopedia "The Great October Socialist Revolution" differs substantially from the previous edition, published 10 years ago. It contains about 200 new articles including articles on "Socialism,", "Defense of the Revolution," "Party Statistics," and "Historiography of October." The article on "Socialism" covers the Decrees on Land and Peace, the "Declaration of the Rights of Russia's Peoples," and other fundamental revolutionary acts of Soviet power. The historical experience of the implementation of the first socioeconomic transformations is more than ever before in tune with our time, the epoch of restructuring.

The article on "Historiography" analyzes in detail the affirmation and development of the Marxist-Leninist concept of revolution. Negative aspects are also noted: The twenties and thirties saw the curtailment of publication of documents and memoirs by participants in the October Revolution, as well as the spread of the illustrative method and of dogmatic and subjectivist assessments of historical events and revolutionary figures engendered by the cult of Stalin's personality.

Over 80 new articles are devoted to the development of the revolution in the provinces and oblasts of the old Russian Empire, making it possible to recreate in one book a comprehensive picture of the unified revolutionary process in the country and the triumphal march of Soviet power. The publication of the third edition coincides in time with a moment when the party and the public face the question of historical science's re-interpreting the assessments prevailing for many years, reopening subjects which were previously banned, and reviving erased names which had been consigned to oblivion.

The work on the encyclopedia's third edition is an attempt by a large number of authors to cast as much light as possible on the historical path traversed by the Soviet people under the CPSU's leadership.

Economic

Abalkin on Scrapping Unprofitable Enterprises

LD240709 Moscow TASS in English 0642 GMT 24 Nov 87

[Text] Moscow November 24 TASS—A program shown by Soviet television Monday dealt with a rational use of manpower resources in the Soviet Union. It summed up the recommendations of a scientific and practical conference on employment problems held recently in the old Russian town of Suzdal.

Prominent Soviet economists who took part in the program pointed out that a course towards further intensification of production and the transfer of hundreds of industrial enterprises to full cost-accounting and self-financing would bring about in the near future the release of manpower, which is a rather unusual phenomenon for Soviet economy.

"A new Soviet law that comes into force next year envisages a possibility of the elimination of a mill or factory if it is not profitable or if its products are no longer in demand," said Leonid Abalkin, director of the Institute of Economy of the USSR Academy of Sciences. Construction alone will need one third less workers than today for the fulfilment of the same production program if the organization of the production process is improved. According to the estimates, by the year 2000 the number of people employed in the sphere of materials production is to be reduced by 15-20 million. The swollen managerial apparatus should also be trimmed off.

Soviet economists believe that dismissals are inevitable. However, they will not result in unemployment. The advantages of planned economy permit to forecast for many years to come possible changes in the structure of manpower resources and to prevent their possible negative consequences.

Leonid Kostin, first deputy chairman of the USSR state Committee for Labour and Social Issues, pointed out that the problem consisted in chanelling manpower released from the production and management spheres to the services sectors which is not developed well enough in this country. The state is willing to take upon itself the expenditures on the retraining of people and preserve their wages of the previous level during the training. Apart from it, a system of incentives will be worked out that would encourage people to move to the regions experiencing a shortage of manpower resources. The employment problem will be resolved in the USSR with due account for the interests of every individual.

New forms of economic management encouraged by the state, for instance, cooperation and individual labour, should also be oriented towards absorbing the released manpower, participants in the TV program pointed out.